Reformulations of Yang-Mills Theories with Space-time Tensor Fields

Zhi-Qiang Guo

Departamento de Física y Centro Científico Tecnológico de Valparaíso,
Universidad Técnica Federico Santa María,
Casilla 110-V, Valparaíso, Chile

E-mail: zhiqiang.guo@usm.cl

Abstract: We provide the reformulations of Yang-Mills theories in terms of gauge invariant metric-like variables in three and four dimensions. The reformulations are used to analyze the dimension two gluon condensate and give gauge invariant descriptions of gluon polarization. In three dimensions, we obtain a non-zero dimension two gluon condensate by one loop computation, whose value is similar to the square of photon mass in the Schwinger model. In four dimensions, we obtain a Lagrangian with the dual property, which shares the similar but different property with the dual superconductor scenario. We also make discussions on the effectiveness of one loop approximation.

Keywords: Higher Derivative Theory, Metric-like Formulation, Gauge Invariant Condensate

arXiv:1410.0327v3 [hep-th] 29 Jan 2016

1 Introduction

Regarding quantum Yang-Mills theories as highly nonlinear theories, it is difficult to achieve an understanding of its infrared region by the perturbative method. There are several approaches which suggest that the infrared region could be described through reformulating the Yang-Mills fields in terms of new variables. In [1], it was proposed that the infrared limit of the $SU(2)$ Yang-Mills theory in 4 dimensions could be given by a nonlinear sigma model by using partially dual variables[1], which are the decomposition of $SU(2)$ gauge field in terms of the coset variables of its $U(1)$ subgroup [6–8]. In [9], it was further proposed that a complete off-shell decomposition of $SU(2)$ field can be implemented through the view of spin-charge separation inspired by the strong correlated electron system.

There are also proposals to reformulate Yang-Mills theories by making use of field strength variables or gauge invariant metric-like variables [10]. Similar to the $U(1)$ Maxwell theory, which can be expressed by the field strength variables, the $SU(2)$ Yang-Mills theory can also be expressed by the field strength variables albeit in terms of an infinite series [11]. In [12], the frame-like fields are used as the pre-potential, and the $SU(2)$ Yang-Mills theory is recast into a R^2 gravity theory in 3 dimensions. In [13], the authors employed the metric-like fields and proposed that Yang-Mills theories could be regarded as the diffeomorphism invariant gravity theory broken by the background dependent ether term [14].

From another different angle, the reformulation or decomposition of gauge field is useful to address physical issues which are closely related to the gauge invariance. In [15], the transverse part of gauge field is used to analyze the gauge invariant dimension two condensate [16–18], which is also been discussed by using the "remaining" part after subtracting an "Abelian" part from the original gauge field [19]. In [20], it was proposed that the gauge invariant contribution of gluon polarization to the nucleon spin can be described by decomposing the gauge field into its physical part and its pure gauge part. In [21], many properties of quantum chromodynamics are discussed by dressed gluon fields, which are gluon fields with its pure gauge parts subtracted as background fields.

Inspired by the above investigations, we attempt to provide analysis on the infrared region of Yang-Mills theory through a novel reformulation and decomposition of the gauge field. At first, we decompose the gauge field into two parts as $A^a_\mu = B^a_\mu + e^a_\mu$. Here e^a_μ can be regarded as the frame-like

[1]For its application to the confinement problem, see [2–4] and the review article [5].

fields in gravity theory, which have the same transformation properties as the gauge field strength. B^a_μ can be regarded as the gauge connection in gravity theory, which can be solved in terms of e^a_μ through imposing compatibility conditions, then a reformulation of A^a_μ in terms of e^a_μ is obtained. The Yang-Mills Lagrangian can then be reformulated by using the metric variable $g_{\mu\nu}$. We show that $g_{\mu\nu}$ provides facilities to analyze the gauge invariant dimension two condensate and give gauge invariant descriptions of gluon polarization.

This paper is organized as follows. In section 2, we discuss the $SU(2)$ Yang-Mills theory in three dimensions (3D), where a dimension two condensate with the value $\frac{\lambda^2}{\pi^4}\kappa^4$ is derived by considering the one loop quantum correction. Here κ^2 is the coupling constant in 3D, which has the mass dimension; And λ is a numerical constant produced by the one loop correction. We also provide arguments to demonstrate that the higher loop expansions are actually strong coupling expansions in subsection 2.4. In section 3, we discuss the $SU(2)$ Yang-Mills theory in four dimensions (4D). We first derive the scalar-vector sector of the full Lagrangian in subsection 3.3. By means of this scalar-vector sector, we propose a duality property between a gauge invariant order parameter and a nonzero dimension two condensate. This phenomenon is similar to but different from the dual superconductor scenario in [1, 9]. In subsection 3.4, we give the one-loop result of the dimension two condensate in 4D, and the effectiveness of the one-loop computation is also discussed. Two subsections 2.2 and 3.2 are used to discuss the relations about the partition function between reformulated theories and Yang-Mills theories. We provide conclusions in section 4. Several appendices are used to provide more details of the paper.

2 $SU(2)$ Yang-Mills Theory in Three Dimensions

2.1 Formulation with space-time tensor field

In 3 dimensional space-time, the Lagrangian of $SU(2)$ Yang-Mills theory is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathscr{L} &= -\frac{1}{4\kappa^2}\eta^{\alpha\mu}\eta^{\beta\nu}F^a_{\alpha\beta}F^a_{\mu\nu}, \\ F^a_{\mu\nu} &= \partial_\mu A^a_\nu - \partial_\nu A^a_\mu + \epsilon^{abc}A^b_\mu A^c_\nu, \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

where $\eta^{\mu\nu} = \mathrm{diag}(1,-1,-1)$ is the Lorentz metric in 3D. We first decompose the gauge field as[2]

$$A^a_\mu = B^a_\mu + e^a_\mu. \tag{2.2}$$

The decomposition (2.2) is familiar with the setting in the 3 dimensional gravity, where this decomposition is used to recast the Chern-Simons theory into a geometrical formulation [23, 24]. Under the gauge transformation, $e_\mu = e^a_\mu\tau^a$ and $B_\mu = B^a_\mu\tau^a$, where τ^a takes values in the $SU(2)$ Lie algebra, have the gauge transformation

$$e_\mu \to U e_\mu U^{-1}, \tag{2.3}$$

$$B_\mu \to U B_\mu U^{-1} - i\partial_\mu U U^{-1}. \tag{2.4}$$

These are similar to that we decompose the gauge field into its background part and its quantum part, then the quantum part transforms as Eq. (2.3) and the background part transforms as Eq. (2.4). Under this decomposition, the field strength has the decomposition

$$F^a_{\mu\nu} = \mathcal{B}^a_{\mu\nu} + \mathcal{T}^a_{\mu\nu} + \epsilon^{abc}e^b_\mu e^c_\nu, \tag{2.5}$$

$$\mathcal{B}^a_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu B^a_\nu - \partial_\nu B^a_\mu + \epsilon^{abc}B^b_\mu B^c_\nu, \tag{2.6}$$

$$\mathcal{T}^a_{\mu\nu} = (\partial_\mu e^a_\nu + \epsilon^{abc}B^b_\mu e^c_\nu) - (\partial_\nu e^a_\mu + \epsilon^{abc}B^b_\nu e^c_\mu). \tag{2.7}$$

Here $\mathcal{B}^a_{\mu\nu}$ is the curvature of B^a_μ, and $\mathcal{T}^a_{\mu\nu}$ has the similar structure to the torsion in gravity theory. In the conventional background approach, B^a_μ is a fixed classical background, which is independent of e^a_μ. In this paper, we require that B^a_μ and e^a_μ satisfy the equation

$$\partial_\mu e^a_\nu + \epsilon^{abc}B^b_\mu e^c_\nu = \Gamma^\rho_{\mu\nu}e^a_\rho. \tag{2.8}$$

[2]For a different approach based on matrix parametrization of $SU(N)$ Yang-Mills theory in 3D, see [22].

This constraint is consistent with the transformations (2.3) and (2.4). This equation is also similar to the compatibility equation in gravity theory. From Eq. (2.8), we can solve B^a_μ as

$$B^a_\mu = -\frac{1}{2}\epsilon^{abc}E^\rho_b(\partial_\mu e^c_\rho - \Gamma^\sigma_{\mu\rho}e^c_\sigma). \tag{2.9}$$

Here E^ρ_a is the inverse of e^a_ρ, that is, $E^\rho_a e^b_\rho = \delta^a_b$ and $E^\alpha_a e^a_\beta = \delta^\alpha_\beta$. As in gravity theory, from Eq. (2.8), we can obtain the metric compatibility condition

$$\partial_\mu g_{\alpha\beta} = \Gamma^\rho_{\mu\alpha}g_{\rho\beta} + \Gamma^\rho_{\mu\beta}g_{\rho\alpha}. \tag{2.10}$$

Here $g_{\alpha\beta} = e^a_\alpha e^a_\beta$ is the metric tensor, and $g^{\alpha\beta} = E^\alpha_a E^\beta_a$ is its inverse. A general solution of Eq. (2.10) is

$$\Gamma^\rho_{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{2}g^{\rho\sigma}(\partial_\mu g_{\sigma\nu} + \partial_\nu g_{\sigma\mu} - \partial_\sigma g_{\mu\nu}) - g^{\rho\sigma}(T^\tau_{\mu\sigma}g_{\tau\nu} + T^\tau_{\nu\sigma}g_{\tau\mu}) + T^\rho_{\mu\nu}. \tag{2.11}$$

Here $T^\rho_{\mu\nu}$ is the torsion tensor. In the following discussions, we shall use the torsion-free condition

$$T^\rho_{\mu\nu} = 0, \tag{2.12}$$

so the connection (2.11) is reduced to the Levi-Civita connection. Under the torsion-free condition, B^a_μ is completely determined by e^a_μ. Because e^a_μ has the same superficial degrees of freedoms with A^a_μ, the torsion-free condition ensures that no extra field variables are introduced. From Eq. (2.8) and using the connections (2.9), (2.11) and (2.12), we can obtain

$$\mathcal{B}^a_{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{2}R^\sigma{}_{\rho\mu\nu}e^c_\sigma E^\rho_b\epsilon^{abc}, \quad \mathcal{T}^a_{\mu\nu} = 0, \tag{2.13}$$

where

$$R^\sigma{}_{\rho\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu\Gamma^\sigma_{\nu\rho} - \partial_\nu\Gamma^\sigma_{\mu\rho} + \Gamma^\tau_{\nu\rho}\Gamma^\sigma_{\mu\tau} - \Gamma^\tau_{\mu\rho}\Gamma^\sigma_{\nu\tau} \tag{2.14}$$

is the Riemann curvature. Using these results, the Lagrangian (2.1) can be rewritten as[3]

$$\mathscr{L} = \mathscr{L}^{(4)} + \mathscr{L}^{(2)} + \mathscr{L}^{(0)}, \tag{2.15}$$

$$-4\kappa^2\mathscr{L}^{(4)} = \frac{1}{4}\eta^{\mu\alpha}\eta^{\nu\beta}(g^{\rho\theta}g_{\sigma\tau} - \delta^\rho_\tau\delta^\theta_\sigma)R^\sigma{}_{\rho\mu\nu}R^\tau{}_{\theta\alpha\beta}, \tag{2.16}$$

$$-4\kappa^2\mathscr{L}^{(2)} = \eta^{\mu\alpha}\eta^{\nu\beta}(\delta^\rho_\alpha g_{\sigma\beta} - \delta^\rho_\beta g_{\sigma\alpha})R^\sigma{}_{\rho\mu\nu}, \tag{2.17}$$

$$-4\kappa^2\mathscr{L}^{(0)} = \eta^{\mu\alpha}\eta^{\nu\beta}(g_{\mu\alpha}g_{\nu\beta} - g_{\mu\beta}g_{\nu\alpha}). \tag{2.18}$$

The Lagrangian $\mathscr{L}$ is divided into three parts in the above. The $\mathscr{L}^{(4)}$ part is not new, as it has been given in [12] in a Hamiltonian analysis of the $SU(2)$ Yang-Mills theory and recently in [25, 26] through the similar approach as we just presented in the above. Because we have decomposed A^a_μ into two parts in Eq. (2.2), compared to the results in [12, 25, 26], we obtain two additional parts $\mathscr{L}^{(2)}$ and $\mathscr{L}^{(0)}$. From the view of effective field theory, the terms $\mathscr{L}^{(2)}$ and $\mathscr{L}^{(0)}$ are both relevant operators. The Lagrangian $\mathscr{L}$ is also similar to the higher derivative gravity of Stelle [27]. In [21], it has been suggested that the infrared region of quantum chromodynamics could be described by the Stelle action, in which the higher derivative terms are responsible for the confinement.

2.2 Relations between Partition Functions

In the previous section, we have expressed the Yang-Mills fields A^a_μ in terms of e^a_μ. A question is that if the reformulated theory is equivalent to the original Yang-Mills theory from the quantum perspective. Obviously, there is a Jacobian matrix corresponding to the variable transformation (2.9). This Jacobian

[3]Here we have two metrics $\eta_{\mu\nu}$ and $g_{\mu\nu}$. The conventions of usage about these metrics are given in appendix A.

matrix has been discussed in [26]. In this subsection, we address this question from a different approach. We consider the partition function

$$Z[B^a_\mu, e^a_\mu] = \int [\mathscr{D}B^a_\mu][\mathscr{D}e^a_\mu][\mathscr{D}j^a_\mu]\exp\big(i\int d^3x(\mathscr{L} + \varepsilon^{\mu\alpha\beta}j^a_\mu \mathcal{T}^a_{\alpha\beta})\big). \tag{2.19}$$

Here $\mathscr{L}$ is the Yang-Mills action (2.1) with the decomposition $A^a_\mu = B^a_\mu + e^a_\mu$. $\mathcal{T}^a_{\alpha\beta}$ is the torsion constraint condition (2.7). By integrating out j^a_μ, we can obtain

$$Z[B^a_\mu, e^a_\mu] = \int [\mathscr{D}B^a_\mu][\mathscr{D}e^a_\mu]\delta\big(\varepsilon^{\mu\alpha\beta}\mathcal{T}^a_{\alpha\beta}\big)\exp\big(i\int d^3x\mathscr{L}\big). \tag{2.20}$$

So $Z[B^a_\mu, e^a_\mu]$ can be understood as the path integral of B^a_μ and e^a_μ with the torsion free condition $\mathcal{T}^a_{\alpha\beta} = 0$. From Eq. (2.20), we plan to integrate out B^a_μ, which requires the solution of the torsion free condition $\mathcal{T}^a_{\alpha\beta} = 0$. The solution has been given in Eq. (2.9)

$$B^a_\mu(e) = -\frac{1}{2}\epsilon^{abc}E^\rho_b(\partial_\mu e^c_\rho - \Gamma^\sigma_{\mu\rho}e^c_\sigma), \tag{2.21}$$

From Eq. (2.20), we obtain

$$Z[B^a_\mu, e^a_\mu] = \int [\mathscr{D}e^a_\mu][\mathscr{D}B^a_\mu]\frac{1}{J_e}\delta\left(B^a_\mu - B^a_\mu(e)\right)\exp\big(i\int d^3x\mathscr{L}(B^a_\mu, e^a_\mu)\big). \tag{2.22}$$

In the above, J_e is the Jacobian factor associated with the variable transformation of the delta function, which is given by

$$J_e = \det\big(\mathcal{M}^{\alpha\beta}_{ab}\big), \tag{2.23}$$

$$\mathcal{M}^{\mu\nu}_{ab} = \frac{\partial\left(\varepsilon^{\mu\alpha\beta}\mathcal{T}^a_{\alpha\beta}\right)}{\partial B^b_\nu} = 2\varepsilon^{\mu\nu\beta}\varepsilon^{abc}e^c_\beta, \tag{2.24}$$

where $\mathcal{M}^{\mu\nu}_{ab}$ is a 9×9 matrix. Integrating out B^a_μ in Eq. (2.22), we obtain

$$Z[e^a_\mu] = \int [\mathscr{D}e^a_\mu]\frac{1}{J_e}\exp\big(i\int d^3x\mathscr{L}(e^a_\mu)\big), \tag{2.25}$$

where $\mathscr{L}(e^a_\mu)$ solely depends on e^a_μ, which is equivalent to the reformulated Lagrangian in Eq. (2.15). From Eq. (2.23), we see that additional Jacobian factor J_e depends only on e^a_μ but not its derivative, which does not influence the path integral [27, 28] and can be abandoned.

In the above, we firstly integrated out B^a_μ, then we obtain the partition function of e^a_μ. Alternatively, we can integrate out e^a_μ at first, then we obtain the partition function of B^a_μ. In this case, it is difficult to solve the constraint $\mathcal{T}^a_{\alpha\beta} = 0$ regarding e^a_μ as the arguments , because $\mathcal{T}^a_{\alpha\beta}$ are partial differential equations of e^a_μ, compared to that they are algebraic equations of B^a_μ. However, the path integral about e^a_μ in Eq. (2.19) is similar to the calculations in the background field method. We add the gauge fixing term and the Faddeev-Popov ghost term to Eq. (2.19)

$$\begin{aligned} Z[B^a_\mu, e^a_\mu] = & \int [\mathscr{D}B^a_\mu][\mathscr{D}j^a_\mu][\mathscr{D}\bar{\eta}][\mathscr{D}\eta][\mathscr{D}e^a_\mu] \\ & \times \exp\left(i\int d^3x(\mathscr{L}(B^a_\mu, e^a_\mu) + \varepsilon^{\mu\alpha\beta}j^a_\mu\mathcal{T}^a_{\alpha\beta} + \mathscr{L}_{\rm GF} + \mathscr{L}_{\rm FP})\right), \end{aligned} \tag{2.26}$$

$$-2\kappa^2\mathscr{L}_{\rm GF} = (D^\mu e^a_\mu)(D^\nu e^a_\nu), \tag{2.27}$$

$$\mathscr{L}_{\rm FP} = \bar{\eta}^a\left(-(D^\mu D_\mu)^{ac} - (D^\mu)^{ad}\varepsilon^{dbc}e^b_\mu\right)\eta^c, \tag{2.28}$$

where

$$D^{ac}_\mu = \partial_\mu\delta^{ac} + \epsilon^{abc}B^b_\mu. \tag{2.29}$$

Integrating out e^a_μ to one loop order, we have the determinant

$$\Big[\det\Big(-\eta_{\alpha\beta}(\eta^{\mu\nu}D_\mu D_\nu)^{ab}+2\varepsilon^{abc}\mathcal{B}^c_{\alpha\beta}\Big)\Big]^{-\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{2.30}$$

Integrating out the ghost fields to one loop order, we have the determinant

$$\det\Big(-(\eta^{\mu\nu}D_\mu D_\nu)^{ab}\Big). \tag{2.31}$$

The functional determinant (2.30) and (2.31) can be computed in a formal series of B^a_μ. The one-loop result for $SU(N)$ Yang-Mills theories can be found in [29]. The total effects of these determinants are to renormalize the coupling constant.

In the above discussions, we begin with the path integral in Eq. (2.19). On one hand, we integrate out B^a_μ at first, then we obtain the reformulated Lagrangian (2.15). Alternatively, we integrate out e^a_μ, then we obtain the effective action of B^a_μ in the background field method. The above discussions provide the relations of the reformulated Lagrangian and the effective action of B^a_μ.

2.3 Scalar Sector

In Eq. (2.15), we have obtained a pure space-time tensor formulation of the Yang-Mills Lagrangian. The dynamical variable of this Lagrangian is a spin-2 tensor $g_{\mu\nu}$. In this subsection, we discuss a simple case of this Lagrangian. Using the Lorentz metric, we decompose $g_{\mu\nu}$ as

$$g_{\mu\nu}=\frac{1}{3}(\eta^{\rho\sigma}g_{\rho\sigma})\eta_{\mu\nu}+\big(g_{\mu\nu}-\frac{1}{3}(\eta^{\rho\sigma}g_{\rho\sigma})\eta_{\mu\nu}\big), \tag{2.32}$$

where

$$\varphi^2(x)=\frac{1}{3}(\eta^{\rho\sigma}g_{\rho\sigma}) \tag{2.33}$$

is the trace part, which is the scalar degree of freedom of $g_{\mu\nu}$. Because the $SU(2)$ group is compact, the diagonal elements of $g_{\mu\nu}$ defined in Eq. (2.10) are all non-negative. Hence we cannot suppose the tensor part on the right hand of Eq. (2.32) is zero. However, for the $SU(2)$ group in the Euclidean space-time or the non-compact $SO(1,2)$ group in the Minkowski space-time, the tensor part can be supposed to be zero. In the following, we shall only give the explicit expression of the scalar sector. The sector including the tensor part can be obtained as a formal series. The scalar sector of the Lagrangian $\mathscr{L}$ in Eq. (2.15) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}\mathscr{L}=&\frac{1}{2}\eta^{\mu\nu}\partial_\mu\phi\partial_\nu\phi-\frac{\kappa^2}{24}\phi^4+\mathscr{L}_{\text{bound}}\\&-\frac{1}{\kappa^2}\frac{1}{\phi^2}(\Box\phi)^2+\frac{1}{2\kappa^2}\frac{1}{\phi^3}(\partial^\nu\phi\partial_\nu\phi)\Box\phi,\end{aligned} \tag{2.34}$$

where we have defined $\phi=\frac{\sqrt{6}}{\kappa}\varphi$, $\Box=\eta^{\mu\nu}\partial_\mu\partial_\nu$, and the boundary term is

$$\begin{aligned}\mathscr{L}_{\text{bound}}=&-\frac{1}{3}\partial^\mu(\phi\partial_\mu\phi)-\frac{1}{2\kappa^2}\partial^\mu\big(\frac{1}{\phi^2}\partial^\nu\phi\partial_\mu\partial_\nu\phi\big)\\&+\frac{1}{2\kappa^2}\partial^\mu\big(\frac{1}{\phi^2}\partial_\mu\phi\Box\phi\big)+\frac{1}{2\kappa^2}\partial^\mu\big(\frac{1}{\phi^3}\partial_\mu\phi\partial^\nu\phi\partial_\nu\phi\big).\end{aligned} \tag{2.35}$$

From Eq. (2.34), we see that the Lagrangian has higher derivative terms and also has dilation-like couplings. We can introduce two auxiliary fields $\theta(x)$ and $\sigma(x)$ to rewrite the Lagrangian (2.34) in the polynomial formulation

$$\begin{aligned}\mathscr{L}=&\frac{1}{2}\eta^{\mu\nu}\partial_\mu\phi\partial_\nu\phi-\frac{\kappa^2}{24}\phi^4-\partial^\mu\theta\partial_\mu\phi\\&-\frac{1}{2}\theta\sigma\phi^4-\frac{1}{4\kappa^2}\sigma^2\phi^6+\frac{1}{4\kappa^2}\sigma\phi(\partial^\mu\phi\partial_\mu\phi).\end{aligned} \tag{2.36}$$

This Lagrangian is similar to the Lee-Wick Lagrangian [30, 31]. The Lee-Wick Lagrangian includes higher derivative terms, but it can be recast into lower derivative formulation by introducing auxiliary ghost fields [32]. In Eq. (2.36), $\theta(x)$ can obtain a ghost-like kinetic term by its mixing with $\phi(x)$.

2.4 Dimension Two Condensate

The nonzero value[4] of dimension two gluon condensate has been suggested [15–18] through several different approaches. From our results in the last subsection, we learned that the metric tensor $g_{\mu\nu}$ is gauge invariant, and it is constructed from the part e^a_μ of A^a_μ. So it provides a natural candidate for the dimension two gluon condensate. In this subsection, we provide analysis to show that a nonzero vacuum expectation of $g_{\mu\nu}$ can be generated by quantum corrections.

We expand $g_{\mu\nu}$ around a constant background $v\cdot\eta_{\mu\nu}$

$$g_{\mu\nu} = v\cdot\eta_{\mu\nu} + h_{\mu\nu}. \tag{2.37}$$

where $h_{\mu\nu}$ is the fluctuation around the constant background. Assuming that $h_{\mu\nu}$ is small, we can express $g^{\mu\nu}$ as

$$g^{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{v}\eta^{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{v^2}\eta^{\mu\rho}\eta^{\nu\sigma}h_{\rho\sigma} + \cdots . \tag{2.38}$$

The quadratic terms of the Lagrangian $\mathscr{L}$ can then be written as

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathscr{L} &= \mathscr{L}^{(4)} + \mathscr{L}^{(2)} + \mathscr{L}^{(1)} + \mathscr{L}^{(0)}, && (2.39)\\
-4\kappa^2\mathscr{L}^{(4)} &= \frac{1}{2v^2}\left(\partial^\mu\partial_\nu h_{\alpha\beta}\partial_\mu\partial^\nu h^{\alpha\beta} - 2\partial_\mu\partial_\nu h_{\alpha\beta}\partial^\mu\partial^\alpha h^{\beta\nu} + \partial_\mu\partial_\nu h_{\alpha\beta}\partial^\alpha\partial^\beta h^{\mu\nu}\right), && (2.40)\\
-4\kappa^2\mathscr{L}^{(2)} &= \frac{1}{2v}\left(-3\partial^\mu h_{\alpha\beta}\partial_\mu h^{\alpha\beta} + \partial^\mu h^\alpha_\alpha\partial_\mu h^\beta_\beta - 4\partial_\mu h^\alpha_\alpha\partial_\nu h^{\mu\nu}\right) && (2.41)\\
&\quad + \frac{1}{v}\left(\partial_\mu h_{\nu\alpha}\partial^\nu h^{\mu\alpha} + 2\partial_\mu h^{\mu\alpha}\partial^\nu h_{\nu\alpha}\right),\\
-4\kappa^2\mathscr{L}^{(1)} &= -2\partial_\mu\partial_\nu h^{\mu\nu} + 2\partial^\mu\partial_\mu h^\alpha_\alpha, && (2.42)\\
-4\kappa^2\mathscr{L}^{(0)} &= 6v^2 + 4v\cdot h^\alpha_\alpha + \eta^{\mu\alpha}\eta^{\nu\beta}(h_{\mu\alpha}h_{\nu\beta} - h_{\mu\beta}h_{\nu\alpha}). && (2.43)
\end{aligned}$$

In the above, the linear term $\mathscr{L}^{(1)}$ is a total divergence term. From Eqs. (2.40)-(2.43), using the projection operators in appendix B, we obtain the kinetic operator

$$\begin{aligned}
D_{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta} &= a_1P^{(2)}_{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta} + a_2P^{(1)}_{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta} + a_3P^{(0,s)}_{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta} && (2.44)\\
&\quad + a_4P^{(0,\omega)}_{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta} + a_5P^{(0,s\omega)}_{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta} + a_6P^{(0,\omega s)}_{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta},
\end{aligned}$$

where the coefficients are

$$\begin{aligned}
a_1 &= -\frac{1}{2v^2}\Box^2 - \frac{3}{2v}\Box + 1, \quad a_2 = 1, && (2.45)\\
a_3 &= -\frac{1}{2v^2}\Box^2 - \frac{1}{2v}\Box - 1, \quad a_4 = 0, && (2.46)\\
a_5 &= a_6 = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{v}\Box + 2\right). && (2.47)
\end{aligned}$$

The inverse of this operator is

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(D^{-1}\right)_{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta} &= \frac{1}{a_1}P^{(2)}_{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta} + \frac{1}{a_2}P^{(1)}_{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta} + \frac{a_4}{a_3a_4 - a_5a_6}P^{(0,s)}_{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta} && (2.48)\\
&\quad + \frac{a_3}{a_3a_4 - a_5a_6}P^{(0,\omega)}_{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta} - \frac{a_5}{a_3a_4 - a_5a_6}P^{(0,s\omega)}_{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta} - \frac{a_6}{a_3a_4 - a_5a_6}P^{(0,\omega s)}_{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta}.
\end{aligned}$$

a_1 can be factorized into

$$\begin{aligned}
a_1 &= -\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{1}{v}\Box + b_+\right)\left(\frac{1}{v}\Box - b_-\right), && (2.49)\\
b_+ &= \frac{1}{2}(\sqrt{17}+3), \quad b_- = \frac{1}{2}(\sqrt{17}-3). && (2.50)
\end{aligned}$$

[4] However, for a null result from the operator product expansion analysis of the lattice result, see [33].

For $v > 0$, we see that the b_- term contributes the tachyonic mode in the propagator (2.48); While the b_+ term and the a_5 term contribute two massive modes.

In Eq. (2.39), we only give the quadratic part of the Lagrangian. The interactive part can also be derived, but we shall not give them here due to the lengthy expressions. Using V_2 and V_4 as the number of the interactive vertex of two derivatives and four derivatives respectively, and N_I and L as the numbers of internal lines and loops, we have the superficial degree of divergence

$$\omega = 3L - 4N_I + 2V_2 + 4V_4. \tag{2.51}$$

Note that the coefficient of N_I is 4 due to the higher power of the propagator. We do not need the gauge fixing term and ghost fields because the propagator (2.48) is invertible. And we also have the relation from the topology of the diagram

$$L = N_I - V_2 - V_4 + 1. \tag{2.52}$$

Using Eq. (2.52) to eliminate N_I from Eq. (2.51), finally we have

$$\omega = 3 - L - 2V_2. \tag{2.53}$$

Thanks to the higher derivative behavior of the propagator, the superficial degree of divergence ω is suppressed by the numbers of loop and two derivative vertex. So the higher derivative Lagrangian (2.39) is actually super-renormalizable by power counting.

To compute the quantum correction to the effective potential to one loop order, we have the determinant

$$[\det(D_{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta})]^{-\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{2.54}$$

Regarding the tensor sub-sector as 6×6 matrix, and computing the determinant of the tensor sub-sector, we have

$$\det(D_{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta}) = \det\left(-\frac{1}{8}\left(\frac{1}{v}\Box + b_+\right)^2\left(\frac{1}{v}\Box - b_-\right)^2\left(\frac{1}{v}\Box + 2\right)^2\right). \tag{2.55}$$

In Eq. (2.55), it is clear that the contributions come from one tachyonic mode and two massive modes assuming $v > 0$. Using this determinant, we obtain the one-loop effective potential

$$\begin{aligned} V_{\text{eff}} &= \frac{3}{2\kappa^2}v^2 + \int \frac{d^3k_{\text{E}}}{(2\pi)^3}\log\left(\frac{1}{v}k_{\text{E}}^2 + 2\right) \\ &\quad + \int \frac{d^3k_{\text{E}}}{(2\pi)^3}\left[\log\left(\frac{1}{v}k_{\text{E}}^2 + b_+\right) + \log\left|\frac{1}{v}k_{\text{E}}^2 - b_-\right|\right], \end{aligned} \tag{2.56}$$

where k_{E} is the Euclidean momentum in 3D. We see that the contributions to the effective potential are divided into two massive modes and one tachyonic mode. Because the tachyonic mode is square in the determinant (2.55), the abstract sign is required in Eq. (2.56). We use the dimensional regularization to compute the effective potential. The details of calculation are given in appendix C. The calculations with the dimensional regularization show that the integrals in Eq. (2.56) are finite in 3D. And finally we obtain the effective potential

$$\begin{aligned} V_{\text{eff}} &= \frac{3}{2\kappa^2}v^2 - \frac{1}{6\pi^2}v^{\frac{3}{2}}(c_1 + c_2 + c_3), \\ c_1 &= 2^{\frac{3}{2}}, \quad c_2 = (b_+)^{\frac{3}{2}}, \quad c_3 = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{2.57}$$

c_1 and c_2 are contributed by two massive modes, and c_3 is contributed by the tachyonic mode, which is zero in 3D by dimensional regularization. V_{eff} has the minimum at

$$\langle v\rangle = \frac{\lambda^2}{\pi^4}\kappa^4, \quad \lambda = \frac{1}{12}(c_1 + c_2 + c_3), \tag{2.58}$$

where λ can be regarded as the effective charge. In the Schwinger model [34] in two dimensional space-time, a nonzero photon mass can be generated from the fermion loop contribution. We see that the dimension two condensate (2.58) have the same structure with the square of the photon mass in two dimensions.

In the above, we have expanded $g_{\mu\nu}$ around a constant background $v \cdot \eta_{\mu\nu}$. Because the Lagrangian (2.15) includes the inverse metric $g^{\mu\nu}$, the Lagrangian (2.15) is an infinite series under the expansion of small $h_{\mu\nu}$. However, because of the higher derivative terms, we show that the quantum theory is renormalizable by power counting. This situation is similar to the higher derivative gravity of Stelle [27], where the higher derivative terms are the main cause for the renormalizability.

In this subsection, we have computed the effective potential at one-loop. One question is that on what kind of condition this one-loop result can be trusted. In quantum Yang-Mills theory, the coupling κ is the unique parameter, and the perturbative computations at lower loops are viable when κ is small. However, a different point appears in the above reformulation of Yang-Mills theory. The difference is that all interactive vertices of the reformulated theory actually are suppressed by the dimension-2 condensate v. By the redefinition $\tilde{h}_{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{\kappa\sqrt{v}} h_{\mu\nu}$, $\tilde{h}_{\mu\nu}$ has the canonical dimension in 3D. The interactive vertex of the lowest dimension has the formulation $\frac{\kappa}{\sqrt{v}}\tilde{h}\partial\tilde{h}\partial\tilde{h}$, which is contributed by Eq. (2.17). The vertices of higher dimensions are suppressed by higher powers of v. Therefore, in the reformulated theory, the higher loop computations shall be suppressed by v generally. The one-loop result in the above remains as a good approximation if v is large. If we use the result of Eq. (2.58) as an approximation of v, then the expansion around the large v corresponds to the large κ. Hence the higher loop expansions basically correspond to the expansions of strong coupling.

2.5 Gauge Invariant Gluon Polarization

The gauge invariant description [35] of gluon angular momentum is an important ingredient to address the nucleon spin problem. For two recent reviews on this problem, see [36, 37]. In [20], a gauge invariant expression is provided through decomposing the gauge field into its physical parts and its pure gauge part

$$A^{a\mu} = A^{a\mu}_{\rm phys} + A^{a\mu}_{\rm pure}, \tag{2.59}$$

in which $A^{a\mu}_{\rm phys}$ transforms as Eq. (2.3), and $A^{a\mu}_{\rm pure}$ transforms as Eq. (2.4). The descriptions of gluon polarization and orbital angular momentum are given by [38–40]

$$\kappa^2 M^{\mu\alpha\beta}_{gs} = -F^{a\mu\alpha}A^{a\beta}_{\rm phys} + F^{a\mu\beta}A^{a\alpha}_{\rm phys}, \tag{2.60}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\kappa^2 M^{\mu\alpha\beta}_{go} &= (x^\beta \mathscr{T}^{\mu\alpha} - x^\alpha \mathscr{T}^{\mu\beta}) \\ &+ x^\beta \eta_{\rho\sigma} F^{a\mu\rho} D^\sigma A^{a\alpha}_{\rm phys} - x^\alpha \eta_{\rho\sigma} F^{a\mu\rho} D^\sigma A^{a\beta}_{\rm phys},\end{aligned} \tag{2.61}$$

where

$$D^\sigma A^{a\alpha}_{\rm phys} = \partial^\sigma A^{a\alpha}_{\rm phys} + \epsilon^{abc} A^{b\sigma} A^{c\alpha}_{\rm phys} \tag{2.62}$$

is the gauge covariant derivative, and $\mathscr{T}^{\mu\nu}$ is proportional to the energy-momentum tensor

$$\mathscr{T}^{\mu\nu} = \eta_{\rho\sigma} F^{\mu\rho}_a F^{a\sigma\nu} + \kappa^2 \eta_{\mu\nu} \mathscr{L}. \tag{2.63}$$

From Eq. (2.2), we know that A^a_μ has been decomposed into two parts B^a_μ and e^a_μ. B^a_μ has the same transform as $A^{a\mu}_{\rm pure}$, though B^a_μ is not a pure gauge field. Now it is appropriate to make the designation

$$A^{a\mu}_{\rm phys} = \eta^{\mu\sigma} e^a_\sigma, \tag{2.64}$$

as they have the same transformation. Through this designation, $M^{\mu\alpha\beta}_{gs}$ can be expressed completely with the tensor fields as

$$\kappa^2 M^{\mu\alpha\beta}_{gs} = -\eta^{\mu\tau}(\eta^{\alpha\theta}\eta^{\beta\gamma} - \eta^{\beta\theta}\eta^{\alpha\gamma})\sqrt{|g|}(\frac{1}{2} R^\sigma{}_{\rho\tau\theta} g^{\rho\lambda} \epsilon_{\gamma\lambda\sigma} + \epsilon_{\gamma\tau\theta}), \tag{2.65}$$

where $|g|$ is the absolute value of the determinant of $g_{\mu\nu}$. In the low momentum limit, the derivative term is relatively small, then $M_{gs}^{\mu\alpha\beta}$ shall be dominated by

$$\kappa^2 M_{gs}^{\mu\alpha\beta} \approx -2\sqrt{|g|}\epsilon^{\mu\alpha\beta}. \tag{2.66}$$

Similarly, $M_{go}^{\mu\alpha\beta}$ can also be expressed by space-time tensor fields and has the decomposition

$$\kappa^2 M_{go}^{\mu\alpha\beta} = M_{gs(0)}^{\mu\alpha\beta} + M_{go(1)}^{\mu\alpha\beta} + M_{go(2)}^{\mu\alpha\beta} + M_{go(3)}^{\mu\alpha\beta} + \frac{1}{\ell^4} M_{go(4)}^{\mu\alpha\beta}. \tag{2.67}$$

Here $M_{go(0)}^{\mu\alpha\beta}$, $M_{go(2)}^{\mu\alpha\beta}$ and $M_{go(4)}^{\mu\alpha\beta}$ are

$$\begin{aligned}
M_{go(0)}^{\mu\alpha\beta} &= x^\beta \mathscr{T}_{(0)}^{\mu\alpha} - x^\alpha \mathscr{T}_{(0)}^{\mu\beta} && (2.68)\\
&+ x^\beta \eta^{\mu\rho}\eta^{\alpha\sigma}\eta^{\tau\theta}(g_{\rho\theta}g_{\tau\sigma} - g_{\rho\sigma}g_{\tau\theta}) - (\alpha \leftrightarrow \beta), && (2.69)\\
M_{go(2)}^{\mu\alpha\beta} &= x^\beta \mathscr{T}_{(2)}^{\mu\alpha} - x^\alpha \mathscr{T}_{(2)}^{\mu\beta} && (2.70)\\
&+ \frac{1}{2} x^\beta \eta^{\mu\theta}\eta^{\alpha\gamma}\eta^{\tau\sigma} R^\lambda{}_{\rho\theta\tau}(\delta^\rho_\sigma g_{\lambda\gamma} - \delta^\rho_\gamma g_{\lambda\sigma}) - (\alpha \leftrightarrow \beta),\\
M_{go(4)}^{\mu\alpha\beta} &= x^\beta \mathscr{T}_{(4)}^{\mu\alpha} - x^\alpha \mathscr{T}_{(4)}^{\mu\beta}.
\end{aligned}$$

In the above, $\mathscr{T}_{(0)}^{\mu\nu}$, $\mathscr{T}_{(2)}^{\mu\nu}$ and $\mathscr{T}_{(4)}^{\mu\nu}$ are the components of $\mathscr{T}^{\mu\nu}$

$$\mathscr{T}^{\mu\nu} = \mathscr{T}_{(0)}^{\mu\nu} + \mathscr{T}_{(2)}^{\mu\nu} + \mathscr{T}_{(4)}^{\mu\nu}, \tag{2.71}$$

and they have the expressions

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathscr{T}_{(0)}^{\mu\nu} &= \eta^{\mu\theta}\eta^{\nu\lambda}\eta^{\tau\gamma}(g_{\theta\gamma}g_{\tau\lambda} - g_{\theta\lambda}g_{\tau\gamma}) - \frac{1}{4}\eta^{\mu\nu}\mathscr{L}^{(0)}, && (2.72)\\
\mathscr{T}_{(2)}^{\mu\nu} &= \eta^{\mu\theta}\eta^{\nu\tau}\eta^{\gamma\lambda}(\delta^\rho_\theta g_{\sigma\gamma} - \delta^\rho_\gamma g_{\sigma\theta})R^\sigma{}_{\rho\lambda\tau} - \frac{1}{4}\eta^{\mu\nu}\mathscr{L}^{(2)}, && (2.73)\\
\mathscr{T}_{(4)}^{\mu\nu} &= \frac{1}{4}\eta^{\mu\alpha}\eta^{\nu\beta}\eta^{\gamma\theta}(g^{\rho\lambda}g_{\sigma\tau} - \delta^\rho_\tau\delta^\lambda_\sigma)R^\sigma{}_{\rho\alpha\gamma}R^\tau{}_{\lambda\beta\theta} - \frac{1}{4}\eta^{\mu\nu}\mathscr{L}^{(4)}. && (2.74)
\end{aligned}$$

The parts $M_{go(1)}^{\mu\alpha\beta}$ and $M_{go(3)}^{\mu\alpha\beta}$ are

$$\begin{aligned}
M_{go(1)}^{\mu\alpha\beta} &= \sqrt{|g|}x^\beta \eta^{\mu\theta}\eta^{\alpha\tau}\eta^{\lambda\gamma}\Gamma^\sigma_{\theta\lambda}\epsilon_{\sigma\gamma\tau} - (\alpha \leftrightarrow \beta), && (2.75)\\
M_{go(3)}^{\mu\alpha\beta} &= \frac{1}{2}x^\beta \eta^{\mu\gamma}\eta^{\alpha\lambda}\sqrt{|g|}R^\sigma{}_{\rho\gamma\theta}\eta^{\theta\tau}g^{\rho\nu}\Gamma^\delta_{\tau\lambda}\epsilon_{\delta\nu\sigma} - (\alpha \leftrightarrow \beta). && (2.76)
\end{aligned}$$

In the low momentum limit, $M_{go}^{\mu\alpha\beta}$ shall be mainly dominated by $M_{go(0)}^{\mu\alpha\beta}$.

In the above, the gauge invariant descriptions of gluon angular momentum have been expressed by the geometrical objects. $M_{gs}^{\mu\alpha\beta}$ in Eq. (2.65) and $M_{go(2)}^{\mu\alpha\beta}$ in Eq. (2.70) both include the contribution from the Riemann curvature, though they have the different tensor structure. $M_{go(1)}^{\mu\alpha\beta}$ and $M_{go(3)}^{\mu\alpha\beta}$ in Eqs. (2.75) and (2.76) also includes the contribution from the Levi-Civita connection. We shall give more discussions on the gluon angular momentum in subsection 3.5.

In the above, we have used the condition that A_μ^a has the decomposition (2.2), in which B_μ^a is determined by the torsion-free condition (2.12). A question is if e_μ^a exists for a given A_μ^a. In subsection 2.1, we solve B_ν^a using the torsion-free equation

$$(\partial_\mu B_\nu^a + \epsilon^{abc}B_\mu^b e_\nu^c) - (\mu \leftrightarrow \nu) = 0, \tag{2.77}$$

which is equivalent to

$$(\partial_\mu A_\nu^a + \epsilon^{abc}A_\mu^b e_\nu^c) - (\mu \leftrightarrow \nu) = 2\epsilon^{abc}e_\mu^b e_\nu^c. \tag{2.78}$$

In order to obtain e^a_μ in terms of A^a_μ, we need to solve Eq. (2.78). Eq. (2.78) is a partial differential equation about e^a_μ, which is not viable to derive explicit solution generally. Here we provide a formal solution based on the Taylor expansion. Supposing that $A^a_\mu(x)$ have the expansion around x^μ_0

$$A^a_\mu(x) = A^a_\mu(x_0) + (x-x_0)^\alpha A^a_{\mu,\alpha}(x_0) + \frac{1}{2}(x-x_0)^\alpha (x-x_0)^\beta A^a_{\mu,\alpha\beta}(x_0) + \cdots . \tag{2.79}$$

We can solve $e^a_\mu(x)$ using the ansatz

$$e^a_\mu(x) = e^a_\mu(x_0) + (x-x_0)^\alpha e^a_{\mu,\alpha}(x_0) + \frac{1}{2}(x-x_0)^\alpha (x-x_0)^\beta e^a_{\mu,\alpha\beta}(x_0) + \cdots . \tag{2.80}$$

From the zero order of Eq. (2.78), we obtain

$$e^a_{[\mu,\nu]}(x_0) = -\frac{1}{2}\epsilon^{abc}(A^b_\mu e^c_\nu - A^b_\nu e^c_\mu)(x_0) + \epsilon^{abc} e^b_\mu(x_0) e^c_\nu(x_0), \tag{2.81}$$

where $e^a_{[\mu,\nu]} = \frac{1}{2}(e^a_{\mu,\nu} - e^a_{\nu,\mu})$. The antisymmetrical part of $e^a_{\mu,\nu}(x_0)$ can be determined by $A^a_\mu(x_0)$ and $e^a_\mu(x_0)$. From the first order of Eq. (2.78), we obtain

$$e^a_{[\mu,\nu]\alpha}(x_0) = -\frac{1}{2}\epsilon^{abc}(A^b_{\mu,\alpha}e^c_\nu + A^b_\mu e^c_{\nu,\alpha})(x_0) + \epsilon^{abc}(e^b_{\mu,\alpha}e^c_\nu + e^b_\mu e^c_{\nu,\alpha})(x_0) - (\mu \leftrightarrow \nu). \tag{2.82}$$

This equation expresses $e^a_{[\mu,\nu]\alpha}(x_0)$ with $A^a_{\mu,\nu}(x_0)$, $e^a_{\mu,\nu}(x_0)$ and $e^a_\mu(x_0)$. This procedure can be performed repeatedly, and the coefficients of $e^a_\mu(x)$ can be determined in order. Therefore, for a given $A^a_\mu(x)$, $e^a_\mu(x)$ can be found by the above Taylor expansion, but $e^a_\mu(x)$ is not uniquely determined.

3 $SU(2)$ Gauge Theory in Four Dimensions

3.1 Formulation with space-time tensor fields

After the discussion on 3 dimensions, we begin to discuss the $SU(2)$ Yang-Mills theory in 4 dimensions in this section. Although the $SU(2)$ Yang-Mills theories in 3D and 4D have the same Lie Algebra, the 4D case is more complicated than the 3D case because of the number of space-time dimension. In 4 dimensional space-time, the Lagrangian of $SU(2)$ Yang-Mills theory is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathscr{L} &= -\frac{1}{4\kappa^2}\eta^{\alpha\mu}\eta^{\beta\nu}F^a_{\alpha\beta}F^a_{\mu\nu}, \\ F^a_{\mu\nu} &= \partial_\mu A^a_\nu - \partial_\nu A^a_\mu + \epsilon^{abc}A^b_\mu A^c_\nu, \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

where $\eta^{\mu\nu} = \mathrm{diag}(1,-1,-1,-1)$ is the Lorentz metric in 4D. As in section 2, we decompose the gauge field as

$$A^a_\mu = B^a_\mu + e^a_\mu. \tag{3.2}$$

Their transformations are similar to that in Eqs. (2.3) and (2.4). Accordingly the field strength has the decomposition

$$F^a_{\mu\nu} = \mathcal{B}^a_{\mu\nu} + \mathcal{T}^a_{\mu\nu} + \epsilon^{abc}e^b_\mu e^c_\nu, \tag{3.3}$$

$$\mathcal{B}^a_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu B^a_\nu - \partial_\nu B^a_\mu + \epsilon^{abc}B^b_\mu B^c_\nu, \tag{3.4}$$

$$\mathcal{T}^a_{\mu\nu} = (\partial_\mu e^a_\nu + \epsilon^{abc}B^b_\mu e^c_\nu) - (\partial_\nu e^a_\mu + \varepsilon^{abc}B^b_\nu e^c_\mu). \tag{3.5}$$

We also require that B^a_μ and e^a_μ satisfy

$$\partial_\mu e^a_\nu + \epsilon^{abc}B^b_\mu e^c_\nu = \Gamma^\rho_{\mu\nu}e^a_\rho. \tag{3.6}$$

Before solving the above equation, we provide some additional information about e^a_α. For $SU(2)$ gauge theory in 4D, e^a_α can be regarded as a 3×4 matrix, which does not have an inverse in the conventional meaning. However, we can define a right-inverse matrix of e^a_α as

$$e^a_\alpha E^\alpha_b = \delta^a_b. \tag{3.7}$$

E^α_a can be regarded as a 4×3 matrix, and Eq. (3.7) imposes 3×3 constraints, so E^α_a exists but are not determined uniquely. Notice that E^α_b is only a right-inverse matrix of e^a_α. The quantity

$$n^\beta_\alpha = e^a_\alpha E^\beta_a \tag{3.8}$$

is not equal to the identity matrix but is an independent tensor. Now we define the metric-like fields

$$g_{\alpha\beta} = e^a_\alpha e^a_\beta, \quad g^{\alpha\beta} = E^\alpha_a E^\alpha_a. \tag{3.9}$$

They are the gauge invariant space-time tensors. From Eq. (3.9), we know that $g_{\alpha\beta}$ is the product of two 4×3 matrices. So $g_{\alpha\beta}$ is not an invertible matrix, and $g^{\alpha\beta}$ is also not invertible. From Eq. (3.7), we obtain the relation between $g_{\alpha\beta}$ and $g^{\alpha\beta}$

$$g_{\alpha\rho}g^{\rho\sigma}g_{\sigma\beta} = g_{\alpha\beta}, \quad g^{\alpha\rho}g_{\rho\sigma}g^{\sigma\beta} = g^{\alpha\beta}, \quad g_{\alpha\rho}g^{\rho\beta} = n^\beta_\alpha. \tag{3.10}$$

The relation (3.10) can be identified with the definition of the Moore-Penrose generalized inverse matrix. So $g^{\alpha\beta}$ can be regarded as a generalized inverse matrix of $g_{\alpha\beta}$. From Eq. (3.7), we also have the identities

$$g_{\alpha\rho}n^\rho_\beta = g_{\alpha\beta}, \quad g^{\alpha\rho}n^\beta_\rho = g^{\alpha\beta}, \quad n^\rho_\alpha n^\beta_\rho = n^\beta_\alpha. \tag{3.11}$$

So n^β_α behaves like a projection tensor, and more discussions about this projection tensor are given in appendix D. From e^a_α and E^α_a, we can define the gauge invariant variables

$$\mathcal{E}_{\alpha\beta\gamma} = \epsilon_{abc}e^a_\alpha e^b_\beta e^\gamma_c, \quad \mathcal{E}^{\alpha\beta\gamma} = \epsilon^{abc}E^\alpha_a E^\beta_b E^\gamma_c. \tag{3.12}$$

They are totally antisymmetrical space-time tensors. They satisfy the identity

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}^{\alpha\beta\rho}\mathcal{E}_{\mu\nu\sigma} &= n^\alpha_\mu n^\beta_\nu n^\rho_\sigma - n^\alpha_\mu n^\beta_\sigma n^\rho_\nu + n^\alpha_\sigma n^\beta_\mu n^\rho_\nu \\ &\quad - n^\alpha_\sigma n^\beta_\nu n^\rho_\mu + n^\alpha_\nu n^\beta_\sigma n^\rho_\mu - n^\alpha_\nu n^\beta_\mu n^\rho_\sigma,\end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

or in an equivalent formulation

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}_{\alpha\beta\rho}\mathcal{E}_{\mu\nu\sigma} &= g_{\alpha\mu}g_{\beta\nu}g_{\rho\sigma} - g_{\alpha\mu}g_{\beta\sigma}g_{\rho\nu} + g_{\alpha\sigma}g_{\beta\mu}g_{\rho\nu} \\ &\quad - g_{\alpha\sigma}g_{\beta\nu}g_{\rho\mu} + g_{\alpha\nu}g_{\beta\sigma}g_{\rho\mu} - g_{\alpha\nu}g_{\beta\mu}g_{\rho\sigma}.\end{aligned} \tag{3.14}$$

There is also a similar identity for $g^{\alpha\beta}$. From Eq. (3.7), we have the projection relations similar to Eq. (3.11)

$$\mathcal{E}_{\alpha\beta\rho}n^\rho_\gamma = \mathcal{E}_{\alpha\beta\gamma}, \quad \mathcal{E}^{\alpha\beta\rho}n^\gamma_\rho = \mathcal{E}^{\alpha\beta\gamma}. \tag{3.15}$$

$\mathcal{E}_{\alpha\beta\gamma}$ and $\mathcal{E}^{\alpha\beta\gamma}$ are totally antisymmetrical tensors in 4D, so they have 4 independent components respectively. We can define

$$V_\mu = \frac{1}{6}\epsilon_{\mu\alpha\beta\gamma}\mathcal{E}^{\alpha\beta\gamma}, \quad U^\mu = \frac{1}{6}\epsilon^{\mu\alpha\beta\gamma}\mathcal{E}_{\alpha\beta\gamma}, \tag{3.16}$$

or equivalently

$$\mathcal{E}_{\alpha\beta\gamma} = -U^\mu\epsilon_{\mu\alpha\beta\gamma}, \quad \mathcal{E}^{\alpha\beta\gamma} = -V_\mu\epsilon^{\mu\alpha\beta\gamma}, \tag{3.17}$$

where $\epsilon^{\mu\alpha\beta\gamma}$ is totally antisymmetric with the convention $\epsilon^{0123} = 1$, and $\epsilon_{\mu\alpha\beta\gamma}$ is obtained from $\epsilon^{\mu\alpha\beta\gamma}$ by raising down the indices with $\eta_{\mu\nu}$

$$\epsilon_{\mu\alpha\beta\gamma} = \eta_{\mu\nu}\eta_{\alpha\rho}\eta_{\beta\sigma}\eta_{\gamma\tau}\epsilon^{\nu\rho\sigma\tau}. \tag{3.18}$$

We have the identities for the vectors U^μ and V_μ

$$g_{\alpha\beta}U^\beta = 0, \quad g^{\alpha\beta}V_\beta = 0. \tag{3.19}$$

Eq. (3.19) shows U^μ is an eigenvector of $g_{\alpha\beta}$ with the eigenvalue 0, which is an equal statement that $g_{\alpha\beta}$ is not invertible. From Eq. (3.14), we have

$$U^\alpha U^\beta = \frac{1}{6}\varepsilon^{\alpha\rho\mu\tau}\varepsilon^{\beta\sigma\nu\theta}g_{\rho\sigma}g_{\mu\nu}g_{\tau\theta}, \tag{3.20}$$

$$V_\alpha V_\beta = \frac{1}{6}\varepsilon_{\alpha\rho\mu\tau}\varepsilon_{\beta\sigma\nu\theta}g^{\rho\sigma}g^{\mu\nu}g^{\tau\theta}, \tag{3.21}$$

which provide another relations between U^μ and $g_{\alpha\beta}$. Using Eqs. (3.7), (3.8) and (3.17), we have the identities

$$n^\alpha_\beta = \delta^\alpha_\beta + U^\alpha V_\beta, \tag{3.22}$$

$$n^\rho_\rho = 3, \quad U^\rho V_\rho = -1. \tag{3.23}$$

With the above identities, now we can start to solve B^a_μ. From Eq. (3.6), B^a_μ is solved as

$$B^a_\mu = -\frac{1}{2}\epsilon^{abc}E^\rho_b(\partial_\mu e^c_\rho - \Gamma^\sigma_{\mu\rho}e^c_\sigma), \tag{3.24}$$

and Eq. (3.6) also yields the condition

$$\partial_\mu g_{\alpha\beta} = \Gamma^\rho_{\mu\alpha}g_{\rho\beta} + \Gamma^\rho_{\mu\beta}g_{\rho\alpha}. \tag{3.25}$$

Substituting Eq. (3.24) into Eq. (3.6), we obtain

$$\partial_\mu e^a_\nu + \epsilon^{abc}B^b_\mu e^c_\nu = \frac{1}{2}e^a_\tau(\partial_\mu n^\tau_\nu + \Gamma^\tau_{\mu\rho}n^\rho_\nu) + \frac{1}{2}E^\tau_a(\partial_\mu g_{\tau\nu} - \Gamma^\rho_{\mu\tau}g_{\rho\nu}). \tag{3.26}$$

If n^τ_ν is the identity matrix, then Eq. (3.25) would imply that Eq. (3.26) is consistent with Eq. (3.6) automatically. However, here n^τ_ν is an independent tensor, so the consistency among Eqs. (3.6), (3.25) and (3.26) requires the condition

$$n^\sigma_\tau(\partial_\mu n^\tau_\nu + \Gamma^\tau_{\mu\rho}n^\rho_\nu - \Gamma^\rho_{\mu\nu}n^\tau_\rho) = 0. \tag{3.27}$$

Using Eqs. (3.10), (3.11) and (3.25), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_\mu g^{\alpha\beta} &= \partial_\mu(g^{\alpha\rho}g_{\rho\sigma}g^{\sigma\beta}) = g^{\alpha\rho}g^{\sigma\beta}\partial_\mu g_{\rho\sigma} + n^\alpha_\sigma\partial_\mu g^{\sigma\beta} + n^\beta_\sigma\partial_\mu g^{\sigma\alpha} \\ &= g^{\alpha\rho}g^{\sigma\beta}\partial_\mu g_{\rho\sigma} + 2\partial_\mu g^{\alpha\beta} - g^{\sigma\beta}\partial_\mu n^\alpha_\sigma - g^{\sigma\alpha}\partial_\mu n^\beta_\sigma,\end{aligned} \tag{3.28}$$

which is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_\mu g^{\alpha\beta} &= g^{\sigma\beta}\partial_\mu n^\alpha_\sigma + g^{\sigma\alpha}\partial_\mu n^\beta_\sigma - g^{\alpha\rho}g^{\sigma\beta}\partial_\mu g_{\rho\sigma} \\ &= g^{\alpha\rho}(\partial_\mu n^\beta_\rho - \Gamma^\tau_{\mu\rho}n^\beta_\tau) + g^{\beta\rho}(\partial_\mu n^\alpha_\rho - \Gamma^\tau_{\mu\rho}n^\alpha_\tau).\end{aligned} \tag{3.29}$$

This is a equation about the generalized inverse metric $g^{\alpha\beta}$. We see that because $g_{\alpha\beta}$ is not invertible, the connection $\Gamma^\tau_{\mu\rho}$ is not compatible with $g^{\alpha\beta}$ any more[5]. From Eqs. (3.25) and (3.29), we further have

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_\mu n^\alpha_\beta &= g^{\alpha\sigma}\partial_\mu g_{\sigma\beta} + g_{\sigma\beta}\partial_\mu g^{\alpha\sigma} \\ &= \Gamma^\tau_{\mu\beta}n^\alpha_\tau + n^\sigma_\beta(\partial_\mu n^\alpha_\sigma - \Gamma^\tau_{\mu\sigma}n^\alpha_\tau),\end{aligned} \tag{3.30}$$

[5]However, the connection, which is compatible with the metric and the generalized inverse metric, exists and we give the derivation in appendix E.

which is equivalent to Eq. (3.27). So Eq. (3.27) is not an independent equation to be satisfied, but it can de derived from Eqs. (3.25). Therefore, to find the connection, we only need to solve Eq. (3.25). A connection which satisfies Eq. (3.25) is given as

$$\Gamma^{\rho}_{\alpha\beta} = g^{\rho\sigma}\Gamma_{\sigma,\alpha\beta} - g^{\rho\sigma}(\Sigma^{\tau}_{\alpha\sigma}g_{\tau\beta} + \Sigma^{\tau}_{\beta\sigma}g_{\tau\alpha}) + \Sigma^{\rho}_{\alpha\beta}, \tag{3.31}$$

in which

$$\Sigma^{\rho}_{\alpha\beta} = \frac{1}{2}(\delta^{\tau}_{\beta} - n^{\tau}_{\beta})g^{\rho\sigma}\Gamma_{\tau,\alpha\sigma} - \frac{1}{2}(\delta^{\tau}_{\alpha} - n^{\tau}_{\alpha})g^{\rho\sigma}\Gamma_{\tau,\beta\sigma}, \tag{3.32}$$

and

$$\Gamma_{\sigma,\alpha\beta} = \frac{1}{2}(\partial_{\alpha}g_{\beta\sigma} + \partial_{\beta}g_{\alpha\sigma} - \partial_{\sigma}g_{\alpha\beta}) \tag{3.33}$$

is the Christoffel symbols of the first kind. The detail to derive the above solution is given in appendix E. The above connection (3.31) is much more complicated than the Levi-Civita connection, which is mainly because $g_{\alpha\beta}$ is not invertible. If we suppose $g_{\alpha\beta}$ is invertible, then $n^{\beta}_{\alpha} = \delta^{\beta}_{\alpha}$ is the identity matrix. So the corrections from n^{β}_{α} vanish, and the connection (3.31) is reduced to the Levi-Civita connection.

Using the above results, we can obtain

$$\mathcal{B}^{a}_{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{2}R^{\sigma}{}_{\rho\mu\nu}e^{c}_{\sigma}E^{\rho}_{b}\varepsilon^{abc}, \quad \mathcal{T}^{a}_{\mu\nu} = 2\Sigma^{\rho}_{\mu\nu}e^{a}_{\rho}, \tag{3.34}$$

where

$$R^{\sigma}{}_{\rho\mu\nu} = \partial_{\mu}\Gamma^{\sigma}_{\nu\rho} - \partial_{\nu}\Gamma^{\sigma}_{\mu\rho} + \Gamma^{\tau}_{\nu\rho}\Gamma^{\sigma}_{\mu\tau} - \Gamma^{\tau}_{\mu\rho}\Gamma^{\sigma}_{\nu\tau} \tag{3.35}$$

is the Riemann curvature with the connection defined by (3.31). The Lagrangian (2.1) has a natural decomposition according to the power counting of derivative

$$\mathscr{L} = \mathscr{L}^{(0)} + \mathscr{L}^{(1)} + \mathscr{L}^{(2)} + \mathscr{L}^{(3)} + \mathscr{L}^{(4)}. \tag{3.36}$$

Here the parts $\mathscr{L}^{(0)}$, $\mathscr{L}^{(2)}$ and $\mathscr{L}^{(4)}$ are

$$-4\kappa^2\mathscr{L}^{(4)} = \frac{1}{4}\eta^{\mu\alpha}\eta^{\nu\beta}(g^{\rho\theta}g_{\sigma\tau} - n^{\rho}_{\tau}n^{\theta}_{\sigma})R^{\sigma}{}_{\rho\mu\nu}R^{\tau}{}_{\theta\alpha\beta}, \tag{3.37}$$

$$-4\kappa^2\mathscr{L}^{(2)} = \eta^{\mu\alpha}\eta^{\nu\beta}(n^{\rho}_{\alpha}g_{\sigma\beta} - n^{\rho}_{\beta}g_{\sigma\alpha})R^{\sigma}{}_{\rho\mu\nu} + 4\eta^{\mu\alpha}\eta^{\nu\beta}g_{\rho\sigma}\Sigma^{\rho}_{\alpha\beta}\Sigma^{\sigma}_{\mu\nu}, \tag{3.38}$$

$$-4\kappa^2\mathscr{L}^{(0)} = \eta^{\mu\alpha}\eta^{\nu\beta}(g_{\mu\alpha}g_{\nu\beta} - g_{\mu\beta}g_{\nu\alpha}). \tag{3.39}$$

They are similar to the situation in 3D, but with the identity matrix replaced by n^{ρ}_{τ}. In 4D, the torsion tensor is not zero any more, and we also have contribution from the torsion in Eq. (3.38). $\mathscr{L}^{(1)}$ and $\mathscr{L}^{(3)}$ are relevant to the torsion and the totally antisymmetric tensor

$$-4\kappa^2\mathscr{L}^{(3)} = 2\eta^{\mu\alpha}\eta^{\nu\beta}R^{\sigma}{}_{\rho\mu\nu}g^{\rho\tau}\Sigma^{\theta}_{\alpha\beta}\mathcal{E}_{\theta\tau\sigma}, \tag{3.40}$$

$$-4\kappa^2\mathscr{L}^{(1)} = 4\eta^{\mu\alpha}\eta^{\nu\beta}\Sigma^{\theta}_{\mu\nu}\mathcal{E}_{\theta\alpha\beta}. \tag{3.41}$$

From Eq. (3.17), we know that the totally anti-symmetric tensor $\mathcal{E}_{\theta\alpha\beta}$ is equivalent to the vector U^{μ}. So in the expression of $\mathscr{L}^{(1)}$ and $\mathscr{L}^{(3)}$, $\mathcal{E}_{\theta\alpha\beta}$ can also be replaced by the vector U^{μ}.

3.2 Relations between Partition Functions

In subsection 2.2, we have discussed the relations between partition functions in 3D case. In this subsection, we discuss the similar relations in 4D. We consider the partition function

$$\begin{aligned} Z[B^{a}_{\mu}, e^{a}_{\mu}] = & \int [\mathscr{D}B^{a}_{\mu}][\mathscr{D}e^{a}_{\mu}][\mathscr{D}V_{\mu}][\mathscr{D}j^{a}_{\mu}][\mathscr{D}N_{\mu}] \\ & \times \exp\big(i\int d^4x(\mathscr{L} + \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}j^{a}_{\mu}V_{\nu}\mathcal{T}^{a}_{\alpha\beta} + \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}N_{\mu}e^{a}_{\nu}\mathcal{T}^{a}_{\alpha\beta})\big). \end{aligned} \tag{3.42}$$

Here $\mathscr{L}$ is the Yang-Mills Lagrangian (2.1) with the decomposition $A^a_\mu = B^a_\mu + e^a_\mu$. $\mathcal{T}^a_{\alpha\beta}$ is the torsion constraint condition (3.5). Different from Eq. (2.19), the vector V_μ is introduced to the path integral, and we have two constraints associated to j^a_μ and N_μ. The first reason to introduce V_μ is that $\varepsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}$ has four indices in 4D; So an extra vector is needed to form a scalar expression in Eq. (3.42). The second reason is that V_μ is required in the reformulation of the Yang-Mills Lagrangian, as V_μ is needed in Eqs. (3.40), (3.41) and (3.22). Using V_μ, E^μ_a can be expressed as

$$E^\mu_a = \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}\epsilon^{abc}V_\nu e^b_\alpha e^c_\beta. \tag{3.43}$$

By integrating out j^a_μ and N^a_μ, we can obtain

$$\begin{aligned} Z[B^a_\mu, e^a_\mu] = &\int [\mathscr{D}B^a_\mu][\mathscr{D}e^a_\mu][\mathscr{D}V_\mu]\exp\big(i\int d^4x\mathscr{L}\big) \\ &\times\ \delta\left(\varepsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}V_\nu\mathcal{T}^a_{\alpha\beta}\right)\delta\left(\varepsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}e^a_\nu\mathcal{T}^a_{\alpha\beta}\right). \end{aligned} \tag{3.44}$$

These integrals yield two constraint conditions in the delta functions. In order to integrate out B^a_μ, we have to solve the constraints

$$\varepsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}V_\nu\mathcal{T}^a_{\alpha\beta} = 0, \tag{3.45}$$

$$\varepsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}e^a_\nu\mathcal{T}^a_{\alpha\beta} = 0. \tag{3.46}$$

Using Eq. (3.6), B^a_μ is given by

$$B^a_\mu(e) = -\frac{1}{2}\epsilon^{abc}E^\rho_b(\partial_\mu e^c_\rho - \Gamma^\sigma_{\mu\rho}e^c_\sigma). \tag{3.47}$$

So the constraints (3.45) and (3.46) are equivalent to

$$\varepsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}V_\nu\mathcal{T}^a_{\alpha\beta} = \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}V_\nu\Sigma^\rho_{\alpha\beta}e^a_\rho = 0, \tag{3.48}$$

$$\varepsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}e^a_\nu\mathcal{T}^a_{\alpha\beta} = \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}e^a_\nu e^a_\rho\Sigma^\rho_{\alpha\beta} = 0. \tag{3.49}$$

or in tensor formulations

$$\varepsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}V_\nu\Sigma^\rho_{\alpha\beta}n^\sigma_\rho = \mathcal{E}^{\mu\alpha\beta}\Sigma^\rho_{\alpha\beta}n^\sigma_\rho = 0, \tag{3.50}$$

$$\varepsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}g_{\rho\nu}\Sigma^\rho_{\alpha\beta} = 0. \tag{3.51}$$

By the identity (3.13), Eq. (3.50) is equivalent to

$$\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{E}_{\mu\alpha\beta}\mathcal{E}^{\mu\theta\tau}\Sigma^\rho_{\theta\tau}n^\sigma_\rho = n^\theta_\alpha n^\tau_\beta\Sigma^\rho_{\theta\tau}n^\sigma_\rho = 0. \tag{3.52}$$

So the constraint (3.50) determines the $n^\theta_\alpha n^\tau_\beta\Sigma^\rho_{\theta\tau}n^\sigma_\rho$ part of $\Sigma^\rho_{\alpha\beta}$ in Eq. (E.17). After contracting the Levi-Civita symbols, Eq. (3.51) can be rewritten as

$$\Sigma^\rho_{\alpha\beta}g_{\rho\sigma} + \Sigma^\rho_{\sigma\alpha}g_{\rho\beta} + \Sigma^\rho_{\beta\sigma}g_{\rho\alpha} = 0. \tag{3.53}$$

From Eq. (3.53), we obtain

$$(\delta^\sigma_\mu - n^\sigma_\mu)(\Sigma^\rho_{\alpha\sigma}g_{\rho\beta} - \Sigma^\rho_{\beta\sigma}g_{\rho\alpha}) = 0, \tag{3.54}$$

which implies

$$(\delta^\sigma_\mu - n^\sigma_\mu)(n^\theta_\alpha\Sigma^\rho_{\theta\sigma}n^\beta_\rho - g^{\beta\theta}\Sigma^\rho_{\theta\sigma}g_{\rho\alpha}) = 0. \tag{3.55}$$

By this equation, the part of $\Sigma^\rho_{\alpha\beta}$

$$(\delta^\sigma_\mu - n^\sigma_\mu)(n^\theta_\alpha\Sigma^\rho_{\theta\sigma}n^\beta_\rho - g^{\beta\theta}\Sigma^\rho_{\theta\sigma}g_{\rho\alpha}) \tag{3.56}$$

is determined to be zero. With Eqs. (3.52) and (3.55), there are four undetermined parts of $\Sigma^{\rho}_{\alpha\beta}$ in Eq. (E.17) left

$$(\delta^{\tau}_{\mu}-n^{\tau}_{\mu})n^{\theta}_{\alpha}\Sigma^{\rho}_{\theta\tau}(\delta^{\sigma}_{\rho}-n^{\sigma}_{\rho}),\quad (\delta^{\tau}_{\alpha}-n^{\tau}_{\alpha})n^{\theta}_{\mu}\Sigma^{\rho}_{\theta\tau}(\delta^{\sigma}_{\rho}-n^{\sigma}_{\rho}), \tag{3.57}$$

$$(\delta^{\tau}_{\mu}-n^{\tau}_{\mu})(\delta^{\theta}_{\alpha}-n^{\theta}_{\alpha})\Sigma^{\rho}_{\theta\tau}(\delta^{\sigma}_{\rho}-n^{\sigma}_{\rho}),\quad n^{\tau}_{\mu}n^{\theta}_{\alpha}\Sigma^{\rho}_{\theta\tau}(\delta^{\sigma}_{\rho}-n^{\sigma}_{\rho}), \tag{3.58}$$

and one undetermined part of $\Gamma^{\rho}_{\alpha\beta}$ in Eq. (E.4)

$$\Gamma^{\rho}_{(\alpha\beta)}(\delta^{\sigma}_{\rho}-n^{\sigma}_{\rho}). \tag{3.59}$$

However, using the properties of the projection tensor in appendix D, we know that the above five undetermined parts actually do not contribute to B^{a}_{μ} in Eq. (3.47) and the Lagrangian (3.36). That is, the solution given by Eqs. (E.4) and (E.17) with the constraints (3.45) and (3.46) gives the same B^{a}_{μ} and the Lagrangian (3.36) as the solution in (3.31). The above discussions show that the constraints (3.45) and (3.46) are enough to give the results in the subsection 3.1.

After analyzing constraints in the above, the next step is to integrate out B^{a}_{μ}. We have

$$\begin{aligned} Z[B^{a}_{\mu},e^{a}_{\mu}] = & \int [\mathscr{D}e^{a}_{\mu}][\mathscr{D}V_{\mu}][\mathscr{D}B^{a}_{\mu}]\exp\big(i\int d^{3}x\mathscr{L}(B^{a}_{\mu},e^{a}_{\mu})\big) \\ & \times \frac{1}{J_e}\delta\big(B^{a}_{\mu}-\hat{B}^{a}_{\mu}(e)\big)\frac{1}{N_e}\delta\big(\varepsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}\epsilon^{abc}e^{a}_{\nu}(B^{b}_{\alpha}-\tilde{B}^{b}_{\alpha}(e))e^{c}_{\beta}\big). \end{aligned} \tag{3.60}$$

In the above, $\hat{B}^{a}_{\mu}(e)$ is the solution given by Eqs. (3.47) and (E.17) with the constraint (3.52). $\tilde{B}^{b}_{\alpha}(e)$ is the solution given by Eqs. (3.47) and (E.17) with the constraint (3.55). J_e and N_e are the Jacobian factor associated with the variable transformation of the delta function. J_e is given by

$$J_e = e_{12-n}\big(\mathcal{M}^{\mu\nu}_{ab}\big), \tag{3.61}$$

$$\mathcal{M}^{\mu\nu}_{ab} = \frac{\partial\left(\varepsilon^{\mu\tau\alpha\beta}V_{\tau}\mathcal{T}^{a}_{\alpha\beta}\right)}{\partial B^{b}_{\nu}} = 2\varepsilon^{\mu\tau\nu\beta}V_{\tau}\varepsilon^{abc}e^{c}_{\beta}, \tag{3.62}$$

and N_e is given by

$$N_e = \mathrm{Det}\big(\mathcal{N}^{\mu\nu}\big), \tag{3.63}$$

$$\mathcal{N}^{\mu\nu} = \frac{\partial\left(\varepsilon^{\mu\tau\alpha\beta}e^{a}_{\tau}\mathcal{T}^{a}_{\alpha\beta}\right)}{\partial\left(\varepsilon^{\nu\theta\rho\sigma}e^{a}_{\theta}B^{b}_{\rho}e^{c}_{\sigma}\right)} = 2\eta^{\mu\nu}, \tag{3.64}$$

where $\mathcal{M}^{\mu\nu}_{ab}$ is a 12×12 matrix. Note that we have used the elementary symmetric polynomials e_{12-n} in Eq. (3.61), where n is the number of zero eigenvalue of matrix, and e_{12-n} can be computed by Eq. (F.2) in appendix F. This is because $\mathcal{M}^{\mu\nu}_{ab}$ is not invertible, and it has one zero eigenvalue, so $n=1$ in Eq. (3.61). For an invertible $k\times k$ matrix M, we have $e_k(M)=\det(M)$, so Eq. (3.61) shall give the conventional Jacobian factor in the invertible situation. Integrating out B^{a}_{μ} in Eq. (2.22), we obtain

$$Z[e^{a}_{\mu}] = \int [\mathscr{D}e^{a}_{\mu}][\mathscr{D}V_{\mu}]\frac{1}{J_e}\frac{1}{N_e}\exp\big(i\int d^{3}x\mathscr{L}(e^{a}_{\mu})\big), \tag{3.65}$$

where $\mathscr{L}(e^{a}_{\mu})$ solely depends on e^{a}_{μ}, which is equivalent to the expression in Eq. (2.15). From Eqs. (3.61) and (3.63), we see that J_e and N_e depend only on e^{a}_{μ} but not its derivative, which shall not influence the path integral [27, 28].

In the above, we obtain the reformulated theory in subsection 3.1 by integrate out B^{a}_{μ} at first. Following the discussions in subsection 2.2, we plan to integrate out e^{a}_{μ}. Similar to the situation in subsection 2.2, solving the constraints in terms of B^{a}_{μ} is difficult because they are partial differential equations of e^{a}_{μ}. However, because the constraints (3.45) and (3.46) are polynomials of e^{a}_{μ}, the path

integral about e^a_μ in Eq. (3.42) can be performed using the similar method in the background field method. We have the path integral

$$Z[B^a_\mu, e^a_\mu] = \int [\mathscr{D}B^a_\mu][\mathscr{D}N_\mu][\mathscr{D}j^a_\mu][\mathscr{D}V_\mu][\mathscr{D}\bar{\eta}][\mathscr{D}\eta][\mathscr{D}e^a_\mu]$$
$$\times \exp\Big(i\int d^3x\big(\mathscr{L}(B^a_\mu, e^a_\mu) + \mathscr{L}_{\rm GF} + \mathscr{L}_{\rm FP}\big)\Big) \tag{3.66}$$
$$\times \exp\big(i\int d^3x(\varepsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} j^a_\mu V_\nu \mathcal{T}^a_{\alpha\beta} + \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} N_\mu e^a_\nu \mathcal{T}^a_{\alpha\beta})\big), \tag{3.67}$$

where

$$-2\kappa^2 \mathscr{L}_{\rm GF} = (D^\mu e^a_\mu)(D^\nu e^a_\nu), \tag{3.68}$$
$$\mathscr{L}_{\rm FP} = \bar{\eta}^a \left(-(D^\mu D_\mu)^{ac} - (D^\mu)^{ad}\varepsilon^{dbc} e^b_\mu\right)\eta^c, \tag{3.69}$$

are the gauge fixing term and the corresponding Faddeev-Popov ghost term, and the gauge covariant derivative is

$$D^{ac}_\mu = \partial_\mu \delta^{ac} + \epsilon^{abc} B^b_\mu. \tag{3.70}$$

To one loop order, we have the determinant from the integral of e^a_μ

$$\big[\det\big(\mathcal{X}^{\alpha\beta}_{ab}\big)\big]^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \tag{3.71}$$

where

$$\mathcal{X}^{\alpha\beta}_{ab} = -\eta^{\alpha\beta}(\eta^{\mu\nu} D_\mu D_\nu)^{ab} + 2\varepsilon^{abc}\mathcal{B}^{c\alpha\beta} + 2\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta\tau\sigma} N_\tau D^{ab}_\sigma. \tag{3.72}$$

We also have the determinant from the ghost term

$$\det\left(-(\eta^{\mu\nu} D_\mu D_\nu)^{ab}\right). \tag{3.73}$$

Note that the constraint (3.46) is quadratic polynomial of e^a_μ, so we have the contribution from N_μ in Eq. (3.72), then the path integral of N_μ is also further required. Because the gauge invariance remains intact in the background method, the total effects of these determinants can be accounted by renormalizing the coupling constant. The contribution from the N_μ term could modify the beta function, which makes the beta function different from that of the conventional Yang-Mills theory. However, if the beta function is still negative, we can think that the modified theory is still close to the Yang-Mills theory but not significantly different. The above discussions provide relations between partition functions in 4 dimensional case, which are more complicated compared to the situation in 3D.

3.3 Scalar-Vector Sector

In the subsection 3.1, we have obtained a metric-like reformulation of the $SU(2)$ Yang-Mills theory in 4D. In this subsection, we shall discuss a simplified version of the Lagrangian (3.36). Because $g_{\mu\nu}$ is not invertible, we propose a parametrization of $g_{\mu\nu}$ as

$$g_{\mu\nu} = \left(\frac{\gamma_{\rho\sigma}U^\rho U^\sigma}{\det(\gamma_{\rho\sigma})}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}}\left(\gamma_{\mu\nu} - \frac{\gamma_{\mu\rho}U^\rho\gamma_{\nu\sigma}U^\sigma}{\gamma_{\rho\sigma}U^\rho U^\sigma}\right), \tag{3.74}$$

where U^μ has been defined in Eq. (3.16), which is the eigenvector of $g_{\mu\nu}$ with zero eigenvalue (3.19). We also suppose that $\gamma_{\mu\nu}$ is invertible and its inverse is $\gamma^{\mu\nu}$. The parametrization (3.74) has three properties: Its determinant is zero; It has U^ν as the eigenvector with zero eigenvalue; It also makes

Eq. (3.20) satisfied. Using $\gamma_{\mu\nu}$ and U^ν, we can also obtain the generalized inverse metric and the projection tensor

$$g^{\mu\nu} = \left(\frac{\det(\gamma_{\rho\sigma})}{\gamma_{\rho\sigma}U^\rho U^\sigma}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}}\left(\gamma^{\mu\nu} - \frac{U^\mu U^\nu}{\gamma_{\rho\sigma}U^\rho U^\sigma}\right), \tag{3.75}$$

$$n^\alpha_\beta = \delta^\alpha_\beta - \frac{\gamma_{\beta\tau}U^\tau U^\alpha}{\gamma_{\rho\sigma}U^\rho U^\sigma}. \tag{3.76}$$

The expressions (3.74), (3.75) and (3.76) are consistent with Eq. (3.10). From Eqs. (3.16) and (3.23), we also have

$$\gamma^{\mu\tau}V_\tau + \frac{U^\mu}{\gamma_{\rho\sigma}U^\rho U^\sigma} = 0, \tag{3.77}$$

which means that

$$V_\mu = -\frac{\gamma_{\mu\tau}U^\tau}{\gamma_{\rho\sigma}U^\rho U^\sigma}, \tag{3.78}$$

so V_μ is completely determined by U^μ, and it is consistent with the constraint (3.23). As in Eq. (2.32), we decompose $\gamma_{\mu\nu}$ into its trace part and its traceless part as

$$\gamma_{\mu\nu} = \varphi^2(x)\eta_{\mu\nu} + (\gamma_{\mu\nu} - \varphi^2(x)\eta_{\mu\nu}), \varphi^2(x) = \frac{1}{4}\eta^{\rho\sigma}\gamma_{\rho\sigma}. \tag{3.79}$$

We also consider that U^μ is expressed as

$$U^\mu = \varphi^3(x)\tilde{a}^\mu(x), \tag{3.80}$$

where the factor $\varphi^3(x)$ ensures that $\tilde{a}^\mu(x)$ is dimensionless. From $\tilde{a}^\mu(x)$, we can define a space-like vector field $a^\mu(x)$

$$\eta_{\mu\nu}a^\mu a^\nu = -1, \quad a^\mu = \frac{\tilde{a}^\mu(x)}{\sqrt{-\eta_{\mu\nu}\tilde{a}^\mu\tilde{a}^\nu}}. \tag{3.81}$$

Because the $SU(2)$ group is compact, we cannot suppose the tensor part of Eq. (3.79) to be zero. In the following, we will only consider the sector of Eq. (3.36) including a^μ and $\varphi(x)$. The explicit expression including the tensor sector can be obtained as a formal series. $g_{\mu\nu}$ can be formally expanded as

$$g_{\mu\nu} \approx \varphi^2(x)(\eta_{\mu\nu} + a_\mu a_\nu), \tag{3.82}$$

where the tensor sector is not shown. Correspondingly, $g^{\mu\nu}$ and n^β_α can be given by

$$g^{\mu\nu} \approx \varphi^{-2}(x)\left(\eta^{\mu\nu} + a^\mu a^\nu\right), \quad n^\beta_\alpha \approx \delta^\beta_\alpha + a_\alpha a^\beta, \tag{3.83}$$

where $a_\mu = \eta_{\mu\sigma}a^\sigma$. Using the above results, the torsion (3.32) is

$$\begin{aligned}\Sigma^\rho_{\alpha\beta} =& -\frac{1}{4}(\eta^{\rho\sigma} + a^\rho a^\sigma)(a_\alpha\partial_\sigma a_\beta - a_\beta\partial_\sigma a_\alpha)\\ &- \frac{1}{4}(a_\alpha\partial_\beta a^\rho - a_\beta\partial_\alpha a^\rho) + \frac{1}{2\phi}(\delta^\rho_\alpha a_\beta - \delta^\rho_\beta a_\alpha)a^\sigma\partial_\sigma\phi.\end{aligned} \tag{3.84}$$

The connection (3.31) have the expression

$$\Gamma^\rho_{\alpha\beta} = \bar{\Gamma}^\rho_{\alpha\beta} + \Psi^\rho_{\alpha\beta}, \tag{3.85}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{\Gamma}^\rho_{\alpha\beta} =& -\frac{1}{2}(a_\alpha\partial^\rho a_\beta - a_\beta\partial_\alpha a^\rho) - \frac{1}{2}a^\rho(\partial_\alpha a_\beta + \partial_\beta a_\alpha)\\ &- \frac{1}{2}a_\alpha a^\sigma(a_\beta\partial_\sigma a^\rho - a^\rho\partial_\sigma a_\beta) + \frac{1}{2}(a_\alpha\partial_\beta a^\rho + a_\beta\partial_\alpha a^\rho),\end{aligned} \tag{3.86}$$

and

$$\Psi^{\rho}_{\alpha\beta} = \frac{1}{\phi}(\delta^{\rho}_{\alpha}\partial_{\beta}\phi + \delta^{\rho}_{\beta}\partial_{\alpha}\phi) + \frac{1}{\phi}a^{\rho}(a_{\alpha}\partial_{\beta}\phi + a_{\beta}\partial_{\alpha}\phi) \\ - \frac{1}{\phi}(\eta_{\alpha\beta}a^{\rho} - \delta^{\rho}_{\alpha}\partial_{\beta})a^{\sigma}\partial_{\sigma}\phi - \frac{1}{\phi}(\eta_{\alpha\beta} + a_{\alpha}a_{\beta})\partial^{\rho}\phi. \tag{3.87}$$

In the above, we have defined $\phi = \frac{\sqrt{6}}{\kappa}\varphi$. Note that $\bar{\Gamma}^{\rho}_{\alpha\beta}$ is independent of ϕ. Using $\bar{\Gamma}^{\rho}_{\alpha\beta}$ and $\Psi^{\rho}_{\alpha\beta}$, the Riemann tensor has the decomposition

$$R^{\sigma}{}_{\rho\mu\nu} = \bar{R}^{\sigma}{}_{\rho\mu\nu} + K^{\sigma}{}_{\rho\mu\nu}, \tag{3.88}$$

where

$$\bar{R}^{\sigma}{}_{\rho\mu\nu} = \partial_{\mu}\bar{\Gamma}^{\sigma}_{\nu\rho} - \partial_{\nu}\bar{\Gamma}^{\sigma}_{\mu\rho} + \bar{\Gamma}^{\tau}_{\nu\rho}\bar{\Gamma}^{\sigma}_{\mu\tau} - \bar{\Gamma}^{\tau}_{\mu\rho}\bar{\Gamma}^{\sigma}_{\nu\tau} \tag{3.89}$$

is the Riemann tensor independent of ϕ, and

$$K^{\sigma}{}_{\rho\mu\nu} = \bar{\nabla}_{\mu}\Psi^{\sigma}_{\nu\rho} - \bar{\nabla}_{\nu}\Psi^{\sigma}_{\mu\rho} + \Psi^{\sigma}_{\mu\tau}\Psi^{\tau}_{\nu\rho} - \Psi^{\sigma}_{\nu\tau}\Psi^{\tau}_{\mu\rho}. \tag{3.90}$$

Here we have defined the derivative

$$\bar{\nabla}_{\mu}\Psi^{\sigma}_{\nu\rho} = \partial_{\mu}\Psi^{\sigma}_{\nu\rho} + \bar{\Gamma}^{\sigma}_{\mu\tau}\Psi^{\tau}_{\nu\rho} - \bar{\Gamma}^{\tau}_{\mu\rho}\Psi^{\sigma}_{\nu\tau}. \tag{3.91}$$

Using the above results, we can obtain the expression for the Lagrangian (3.36). The complete expressions of this Lagrangian are lengthy. The lower derivative part of $\mathscr{L}$ is given by

$$\mathscr{L} \approx \frac{1}{2}\partial_{\alpha}\phi\partial^{\alpha}\phi - \frac{\kappa^2}{24}\phi^4 \\ + \frac{3}{4}a^{\alpha}a^{\beta}\partial_{\alpha}\phi\partial_{\beta}\phi + \frac{1}{6}(2a^{\beta}\partial_{\alpha}a^{\alpha} + a^{\alpha}\partial_{\alpha}a^{\beta})\phi\partial_{\beta}\phi \\ + \frac{1}{24}\phi^2(3\partial_{\alpha}a^{\beta}\partial_{\beta}a^{\alpha} - \partial_{\alpha}a^{\beta}\partial^{\alpha}a_{\beta} - a^{\alpha}a^{\beta}\partial_{\alpha}a^{\rho}\partial_{\beta}a_{\rho}), \tag{3.92}$$

where a total divergence term

$$\mathscr{L}_{\rm bound} = \partial_{\alpha}\big(\frac{1}{12}\phi^2(a^{\beta}\partial_{\beta}a^{\alpha} - a^{\alpha}\partial_{\beta}a^{\beta}) - \frac{1}{3}\phi(a^{\alpha}a^{\beta}\partial_{\beta}\phi + \partial^{\alpha}\phi)\big) \tag{3.93}$$

has been subtracted. Eq. (3.92) is different from Eq. (2.34), which is a pure scalar theory. In Eq. (3.92), a nonzero value of the quantity

$$\langle 3\partial_{\alpha}a^{\beta}\partial_{\beta}a^{\alpha} - \partial_{\alpha}a^{\beta}\partial^{\alpha}a_{\beta} - a^{\alpha}a^{\beta}\partial_{\alpha}a^{\rho}\partial_{\beta}a_{\rho}\rangle = m^2 \tag{3.94}$$

shall yield a nonzero virtual mass for ϕ. This virtual massive term together with $\frac{\kappa^2}{24}\phi^4$ support a minimum for a nonzero value of ϕ. Inversely, when ϕ takes a nonzero constant value, that is

$$\langle\phi\rangle = v. \tag{3.95}$$

In this case, Eq. (3.36) is the Lagrangian of the unit vector a_{μ}. It is possible that the Lagrangian (3.36) supports nontrivial classical solution of finite energy.

Now we give comparisons of the above result to the dual superconductor scenario [41–43]. In [1], the $SU(2)$ gauge field is decomposed in terms of a unit 3-vector $\mathbf{n}$, an Abelian field C_{μ} and two scalar fields $\rho(x)$ and $\sigma(x)$. The condensate of the order parameter $\mathbf{n}$ yields the Abelian-Higgs model, which supports vortex solutions [44]. The vortex solutions are responsible for the string-like force in the large distance. In the dual view, the condensate of $\rho(x)$ and $\sigma(x)$ yields a Lagrangian of the order parameter $\mathbf{n}$. This Lagrangian has the structure of non-linear σ model, which supports knot-like solutions of finite energy [9]. The picture of our above result of this subsection has the similar interpretation to this dual

scenario. Here $\phi^2(x)$ as the scalar freedom of $\gamma_{\mu\nu}$, has the natural interpretation as the candidate of the dimension two condensate. While the unit vector a_μ serves as the order parameter. In the above discussions, the scalar-vector sector of Eq. (3.92) is a Lagrangian about ϕ and a_μ. From Eq. (3.94), we knew that the nonzero condensate of a_μ yields a nonzero condensate of ϕ. If ϕ obtains a nonzero condensate as Eq. (3.95), then Eq. (3.36) produces a Lagrangian about a_μ. We conjecture that it could support classical solutions of finite energy.

There is an additional question required to be discussed for the scalar-vector sector in the above. For the $SU(2)$ group in Euclidean space-time or the $SO(1,2)$ group in Minkowski space-time, the tensor part can be supposed to be zero, then the Lagrangian $\mathscr{L}$ (3.36) can be reduced to the scalar-vector sector similar to the expression in Eq. (3.92). A question is that equations of motion (EOMs) of the scalar-vector Lagrangian may produce solutions which does not solve the original Yang-Mills equations. For the Faddeev-Niemi decomposition in [1], this question has been analyzed in [45, 46]. For the $SU(2)$ Yang-Mills theory in 4D, there are 12 EOMs for A^a_μ, 3 of which are the Gaussian constraints. The Faddeev-Niemi decomposition in [1] reduces the numbers of field variables. As a consequence, there are 8 EOMs, while the Gaussian constraints are missed. Therefore, EOMs of the Faddeev-Niemi decomposition produce solutions with an external source term, which are not solutions of the Yang-Mills equations. For the scalar-vector Lagrangian in the above, the numbers of the fields variables are reduced to be 4, hence EOMs of this Lagrangian may also produce solutions which does not solve the Yang-Mills equations.

3.4 Dimension Two Condensate

Similar to that in the subsection 2.4, $g_{\mu\nu}$ is gauge invariant and has the natural interpretation as the dimension two condensate. However, an important point different from section 2 is that $g_{\mu\nu}$ is not invertible as we discussed in the subsection 3.1. We have provided a parametrization of $g_{\mu\nu}$ in Eq. (3.74). For the convenience of analyzing the dimension two condensate, here we propose an alternative parametrization of $g_{\mu\nu}$ as

$$g_{\mu\nu} = C^{\frac{1}{3}} p^\rho_\mu p^\sigma_\nu \gamma_{\rho\sigma}, \tag{3.96}$$

where

$$p^\alpha_\beta = \delta^\alpha_\beta - \frac{\eta_{\beta\rho} U^\rho U^\alpha}{\eta_{\rho\sigma} U^\rho U^\sigma} \tag{3.97}$$

is the project tensor, and

$$C = \frac{1}{\det(\gamma_{\rho\sigma})} \frac{(\eta_{\rho\sigma} U^\rho U^\sigma)^2}{\gamma^{\rho\sigma}\eta_{\rho\tau}\eta_{\sigma\theta} U^\tau U^\theta}. \tag{3.98}$$

Similar to that in Eq. (3.74), the parametrization in Eq. (3.96) also satisfies three constraints: The determinant of $g_{\mu\nu}$ is zero; $g_{\mu\nu}$ has the eigenvector U^μ with zero eigenvalue; And Eq. (3.20) is satisfied. With this parametrization, the expression for $g^{\mu\nu}$ cannot be derived straightforwardly as in Eq. (3.75), but it can be derived using the Cayley-Hamilton theorem. We give the derivation of $g^{\mu\nu}$ in appendix F. In order to discuss the dimension two condensate, we expand $\gamma_{\mu\nu}$ and U^μ around constant background as

$$\gamma_{\mu\nu} = v \cdot \eta_{\mu\nu} + f_{\mu\nu}, \tag{3.99}$$

$$U^\mu = v^{\frac{3}{2}} n^\mu + v^{\frac{1}{2}} u^\mu, \tag{3.100}$$

where v is constant and positive, and n^μ is a constant space-like vector

$$\eta_{\mu\nu} n^\mu n^\nu = -1. \tag{3.101}$$

In Eqs. (3.99) and (3.100), the power of v is chosen by accounting the dimension of $\gamma_{\mu\nu}$ and U^μ. One question is that the constant vector n^μ may break the Lorentz invariance. However, in the subsequent

computation of the effective potential, n^μ can be eliminated using the constraint (3.101). So the effective potential shall only depend on v. With these expansions, $g_{\mu\nu}$ can be approximated as

$$\begin{aligned} g_{\mu\nu} &= (\eta_{\mu\nu} + n_\mu n_\nu)\big(v - \frac{1}{3}(2u_\sigma n^\sigma + f^\sigma_\sigma + f_{\rho\sigma}n^\rho n^\sigma)\big) \\ &+ \bar{p}^\rho_\mu \bar{p}^\sigma_\nu f_{\rho\sigma} + \big(n_\mu u_\nu + u_\mu n_\nu + 2n_\mu n_\nu (u_\sigma n^\sigma)\big) + \cdots, \end{aligned} \tag{3.102}$$

where $\bar{p}^\alpha_\beta$ is the constant project tensor

$$\bar{p}^\alpha_\beta = \delta^\alpha_\beta + n_\beta n^\alpha. \tag{3.103}$$

The generalized inverse metric $g^{\mu\nu}$ in Eq. (F.8) can be expanded as

$$\begin{aligned} g^{\mu\nu} &= (\eta^{\mu\nu} + n^\mu n^\nu)\big(\frac{1}{v} + \frac{1}{3v^2}(2u_\sigma n^\sigma + f^\sigma_\sigma + f_{\rho\sigma}n^\rho n^\sigma)\big) \\ &- \frac{1}{v^2}\bar{p}^{\mu\rho}\bar{p}^{\nu\sigma}f_{\rho\sigma} + \frac{1}{v^2}\big(n^\mu u^\nu + u^\mu n^\nu + 2n^\mu n^\nu (u_\sigma n^\sigma)\big) + \cdots, \end{aligned} \tag{3.104}$$

and the projector vector n^α_β in Eq. (3.10) is expanded as

$$n^\alpha_\beta = (\delta^\alpha_\beta + n_\beta n^\alpha) + \frac{1}{v}\big(n_\beta u^\alpha + u_\beta n^\alpha + 2n_\beta n^\alpha (u_\sigma n^\sigma)\big) + \cdots. \tag{3.105}$$

Although $f_{\mu\nu}$ in Eq. (3.99) has ten components, only its projected part $\bar{f}_{\mu\nu} = \bar{p}^\rho_\mu \bar{p}^\sigma_\nu f_{\rho\sigma}$ contributes to $g_{\mu\nu}$ and $g^{\mu\nu}$. $\bar{f}_{\mu\nu}$ satisfies the transverse and traceless conditions

$$n^\mu \bar{f}_{\mu\nu} = 0, \quad n^\mu n^\nu \bar{f}_{\mu\nu} = 0, \tag{3.106}$$

so $\bar{f}_{\mu\nu}$ has 5 effective freedoms, which are equivalent to the components of the massive spin-2 field. u_μ has four freedoms. So $g_{\mu\nu}$ has 9 freedoms totally, which is consistent with the fact that $g_{\mu\nu}$ is a degenerate and symmetric tensor. We can define a new tensor $h_{\mu\nu}$

$$h_{\mu\nu} = \bar{p}^\rho_\mu \bar{p}^\sigma_\nu f_{\rho\sigma} + \big(n_\mu u_\nu + u_\mu n_\nu + n_\mu n_\nu (u_\sigma n^\sigma)\big), \tag{3.107}$$

then we have

$$u_\mu = -h_{\mu\nu}n^\nu, \tag{3.108}$$

that is, u_μ can be projected out from $h_{\mu\nu}$. So the tensor $\bar{f}_{\mu\nu}$ and the vector u_μ can be packed into a single tensor $h_{\mu\nu}$. In the following discussions, we shall use $h_{\mu\nu}$ as the dynamical variables. In terms of $h_{\mu\nu}$, $g_{\mu\nu}$ and $g^{\mu\nu}$ can be simplified as

$$\begin{aligned} g_{\mu\nu} &= (\eta_{\mu\nu} + n_\mu n_\nu)\big(v - \frac{1}{3}(h + \varphi)\big) \\ &+ h_{\mu\nu} + \varphi n_\mu n_\nu + \cdots, \end{aligned} \tag{3.109}$$

$$\begin{aligned} g^{\mu\nu} &= (\eta^{\mu\nu} + n^\mu n^\nu)\big(\frac{1}{v} + \frac{1}{3v^2}(h + \varphi)\big) - \frac{1}{v^2}h^{\mu\nu} \\ &- \frac{1}{v^2}\big(2n^\mu h^{\nu\sigma}n_\sigma + 2n^\nu h^{\mu\sigma}n_\sigma - 3\varphi n^\mu n^\nu\big) + \cdots, \end{aligned} \tag{3.110}$$

where we have used the definitions

$$h = \eta^{\mu\nu}h_{\mu\nu}, \quad \varphi = -n^\mu n^\nu h_{\mu\nu}. \tag{3.111}$$

We see that $g_{\mu\nu}$ and $g^{\mu\nu}$ can be expressed by $h_{\mu\nu}$, and n^α_β in Eq. (3.105) can also be expressed by $h_{\mu\nu}$ using Eq. (3.108). Using the above expressions, we can obtain the expressions for the higher derivative

part of the Lagrangian (3.36)

$$
\begin{aligned}
4\kappa^2 v^2 \mathscr{L}^{(4)} =& -\frac{1}{2}(\eta^{\mu\nu}+n^\mu n^\nu)\partial_\mu\partial_\rho h_{\alpha\beta}\partial_\nu\partial^\rho h^{\alpha\beta}+\frac{1}{2}(2\eta^{\rho\sigma}+n^\rho n^\sigma)\partial_\rho\partial_\alpha h_{\nu\beta}\partial_\sigma\partial^\nu h^{\alpha\beta}\\
&-\frac{1}{2}(\partial_\alpha\partial_\beta h^{\alpha\beta})^2-\frac{1}{2}\partial_\mu\partial_\nu u_\sigma\partial^\mu\partial^\nu u^\sigma+\frac{1}{2}\partial_\mu\partial_\sigma u_\nu\partial^\mu\partial^\nu u^\sigma+\frac{2}{3}n^\rho\partial_\rho\partial_\sigma(h+\varphi)\partial^\sigma\partial_\alpha u^\alpha\\
&+n^\rho\partial_\rho\partial_\sigma h_{\mu\nu}\partial^\mu\partial^\nu u^\sigma-n^\rho\partial_\rho\partial_\mu h_{\sigma\nu}\partial^\mu\partial^\nu u^\sigma-\frac{1}{3}\partial_\alpha\partial_\beta(h+\varphi)\partial_\rho\partial^\rho h^{\alpha\beta}\\
&+\frac{1}{9}(\eta^{\mu\nu}+n^\mu n^\nu)\partial_\mu\partial_\rho(2h-\varphi)\partial_\nu\partial^\rho(h+\varphi)-\frac{1}{3}\partial_\mu\partial_\nu\varphi\partial^\mu\partial^\nu(h+\varphi).
\end{aligned}
\tag{3.112}
$$

The quadratic derivative part in (3.38) is

$$
\begin{aligned}
-4\kappa^2 v\mathscr{L}^{(2)} =& -\frac{1}{2}(3\eta^{\mu\nu}+4n^\mu n^\nu)\partial_\mu h_{\alpha\beta}\partial_\nu h^{\alpha\beta}+3\partial^\mu h_{\mu\alpha}\partial_\nu h^{\nu\alpha}\\
&+4n^\rho\partial_\rho h\partial_\alpha u^\alpha-6n^\rho\partial_\rho h_{\alpha\beta}\partial_\alpha u^\beta-2\partial_\alpha u_\beta\partial^\alpha u^\beta+2\partial_\alpha(\varphi-h)\partial_\beta h^{\alpha\beta}\\
&-\partial_\mu\varphi\partial^\mu(\varphi+2h)-\frac{1}{6}\partial_\mu h\partial^\mu(h-2\varphi)+(\eta^{\mu\nu}+n^\mu n^\nu)\partial_\mu h\partial_\nu h.
\end{aligned}
\tag{3.113}
$$

The Fierz-Pauli type massive term in Eq. (3.39) is expressed as

$$
-4\kappa^2\mathscr{L}^{(0)}=6v^2-h_{\alpha\beta}h^{\alpha\beta}+\frac{1}{3}h^2-\frac{2}{3}\varphi h+4\varphi^2-8v\varphi. \tag{3.114}
$$

And we also have the term in Eq. (3.40) including the antisymmetric tensor

$$
\begin{aligned}
-4\kappa^2 v^{\frac{3}{2}}\mathscr{L}^{(3)} =& \varepsilon^{\tau\alpha\beta\theta}n_\tau\partial_\mu\partial_\theta u_\beta\partial^\mu u_\alpha+\varepsilon^{\mu\rho\sigma\theta}n_\mu n^\alpha\partial_\alpha\partial_\theta h_{\rho\beta}n^\tau\partial_\tau h^\beta_\sigma\\
&+2\varepsilon^{\alpha\mu\rho\sigma}n_\alpha\partial_\beta\partial_\rho u_\mu n^\tau\partial_\tau h^\beta_\sigma.
\end{aligned}
\tag{3.115}
$$

The quadratic term of Eq. (3.41) is zero. In the above expressions, u_μ is determined by Eq. (3.108). So the above equations give the kinetic part of the tensor $h_{\mu\nu}$. In order to obtain the kinetic operator, we can define the operators

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{P}^{(k,1)}_{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta} &= \eta_{\mu\nu}\eta_{\alpha\beta},\quad \mathcal{P}^{(k,2)}_{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta}=\eta_{\mu\alpha}\eta_{\nu\beta}+\eta_{\mu\beta}\eta_{\nu\alpha},\\
\mathcal{P}^{(k,3)}_{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta} &= \eta_{\mu\nu}\partial_\alpha\partial_\beta+\eta_{\alpha\beta}\partial_\mu\partial_\nu,\quad \mathcal{P}^{(k,5)}_{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta}=\partial_\mu\partial_\nu\partial_\alpha\partial_\beta,\\
\mathcal{P}^{(k,4)}_{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta} &= (\eta_{\mu\alpha}\partial_\nu\partial_\beta+\eta_{\nu\alpha}\partial_\mu\partial_\beta)+(\alpha\leftrightarrow\beta).
\end{aligned}
\tag{3.116}
$$

These operators belong to the class of the projection operators in appendix B. However, here we also have three operators constructed from n_μ

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{P}^{(n,1)}_{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta} &= \eta_{\mu\nu}n_\alpha n_\beta+\eta_{\alpha\beta}n_\mu n_\nu,\quad \mathcal{P}^{(n,3)}_{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta}=n_\mu n_\nu n_\alpha n_\beta,\\
\mathcal{P}^{(n,2)}_{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta} &= (\eta_{\mu\alpha}n_\nu n_\beta+\eta_{\nu\alpha}n_\mu n_\beta)+(\alpha\leftrightarrow\beta),
\end{aligned}
\tag{3.117}
$$

and six composite operators constructed from n_μ and the partial derivative

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{P}^{(nk,1)}_{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta} &= n_\mu n_\nu\partial_\alpha\partial_\beta+n_\alpha n_\beta\partial_\mu\partial_\nu,\ \mathcal{P}^{(nk,2)}_{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta}=(n_\mu n_\alpha\partial_\nu\partial_\beta+n_\nu n_\alpha\partial_\mu\partial_\beta)+(\alpha\leftrightarrow\beta),\\
\mathcal{P}^{(nk,3)}_{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta} &= \eta_{\mu\nu}(n_\alpha\partial_\beta+n_\beta\partial_\alpha)+\eta_{\alpha\beta}(n_\mu\partial_\nu+n_\nu\partial_\mu),\\
\mathcal{P}^{(nk,4)}_{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta} &= n_\mu n_\nu(n_\alpha\partial_\beta+n_\beta\partial_\alpha)+n_\alpha n_\beta(n_\mu\partial_\nu+n_\nu\partial_\mu),\\
\mathcal{P}^{(nk,5)}_{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta} &= (n_\mu\partial_\nu+n_\nu\partial_\mu)\partial_\alpha\partial_\beta+(n_\alpha\partial_\beta+n_\beta\partial_\alpha)\partial_\mu\partial_\nu,\\
\mathcal{P}^{(nk,6)}_{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta} &= \big(\eta_{\mu\alpha}(n_\nu\partial_\beta+n_\beta\partial_\nu)+\eta_{\nu\alpha}(n_\mu\partial_\beta+n_\beta\partial_\mu)\big)+(\alpha\leftrightarrow\beta).
\end{aligned}
\tag{3.118}
$$

And Eq. (3.115) also provides four operators relevant to the antisymmetric tensor

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{P}^{(\varepsilon,1)}_{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta} &= (\eta_{\mu\alpha}\varepsilon_{\nu\beta\rho\sigma}n^\sigma\partial^\rho + \eta_{\nu\alpha}\varepsilon_{\mu\beta\rho\sigma}n^\sigma\partial^\rho) + (\alpha\leftrightarrow\beta),\\
\mathcal{P}^{(\varepsilon,2)}_{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta} &= (n_\mu n_\alpha\varepsilon_{\nu\beta\rho\sigma}n^\sigma\partial^\rho + n_\nu n_\alpha\varepsilon_{\mu\beta\rho\sigma}n^\sigma\partial^\rho) + (\alpha\leftrightarrow\beta),\\
\mathcal{P}^{(\varepsilon,3)}_{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta} &= (\varepsilon_{\nu\beta\rho\sigma}n^\sigma\partial^\rho\partial_\mu\partial_\alpha + \varepsilon_{\mu\beta\rho\sigma}n^\sigma\partial^\rho\partial_\nu\partial_\alpha) + (\alpha\leftrightarrow\beta),\\
\mathcal{P}^{(\varepsilon,4)}_{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta} &= \big(\varepsilon_{\nu\beta\rho\sigma}n^\sigma\partial^\rho(n_\mu\partial_\alpha + n_\alpha\partial_\mu) + \varepsilon_{\mu\beta\rho\sigma}n^\sigma\partial^\rho(n_\nu\partial_\alpha + n_\alpha\partial_\nu)\big) + (\alpha\leftrightarrow\beta).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.119}$$

Using the above operators, the kinetic operator of $h_{\mu\nu}$ can be written as

$$\mathcal{D}_{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta} = \sum_{i=1}^{5} a_i\mathcal{P}^{(k,i)}_{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta} + \sum_{i=1}^{3} b_i\mathcal{P}^{(n,i)}_{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta} + \sum_{i=1}^{6} f_i\mathcal{P}^{(nk,i)}_{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta} + \sum_{i=1}^{4} x_i\mathcal{P}^{(\varepsilon,i)}_{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta}. \tag{3.120}$$

The coefficients of this operator can be obtained from Eqs. (3.112)-(3.115). The coefficients a_i are

$$\begin{aligned}
a_1 &= -\frac{2}{9v^2}\big(\Box + (n\cdot\partial)^2\big)\Box - \frac{1}{6v}\big(5\Box + 6(n\cdot\partial)^2\big) + \frac{1}{3},\\
a_2 &= \frac{1}{4v^2}\big(\Box + (n\cdot\partial)^2\big)\Box + \frac{1}{4v}\big(3\Box + 4(n\cdot\partial)^2\big) - \frac{1}{2},\\
a_3 &= \frac{1}{6v^2}\Box + \frac{1}{v},\ a_4 = -\frac{1}{8v^2}\big(2\Box + (n\cdot\partial)^2\big) - \frac{3}{4v},\ a_5 = \frac{1}{2v^2},
\end{aligned} \tag{3.121}$$

where $\Box = \eta^{\mu\nu}\partial_\mu\partial_\nu$ is the Laplace operator, and $n\cdot\partial = \eta^{\mu\nu}n_\mu\partial_\nu$. The coefficients b_i are

$$\begin{aligned}
b_1 &= -\frac{1}{18v^2}\big(2\Box - (n\cdot\partial)^2\big)\Box - \frac{5}{6v}\Box + \frac{1}{3},\\
b_2 &= \frac{1}{8v^2}(\Box + 4v)\Box,\ b_3 = \frac{1}{9v^2}\big(4\Box + (n\cdot\partial)^2\big)\Box + \frac{1}{v}\Box + 4.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.122}$$

The coefficients f_i are

$$\begin{aligned}
f_1 &= -\frac{1}{6v^2}\Box + \frac{1}{v},\ f_2 = -\frac{1}{8v^2}\Box,\ f_3 = \frac{1}{6v^2}(\Box + 6v)(n\cdot\partial),\\
f_4 &= -\frac{1}{6v^2}(n\cdot\partial)\Box,\ f_5 = \frac{1}{4v^2}(n\cdot\partial),\ f_6 = -\frac{1}{8v^2}(\Box + 6v)(n\cdot\partial),
\end{aligned} \tag{3.123}$$

and the coefficients x_i are

$$x_1 = -\frac{1}{4v^{\frac{3}{2}}}(n\cdot\partial)^2,\ x_2 = -\frac{1}{4v^{\frac{3}{2}}}\Box,\ x_3 = 0,\ x_4 = \frac{1}{4v^{\frac{3}{2}}}(n\cdot\partial). \tag{3.124}$$

In Eqs. (3.112)-(3.115), we have given the expressions for the quadratic part of the Lagrangian. The interactive part can also be derived. If we use V_1 and V_3 stand for the number of the vertex of one and three derivatives respectively. Then similar to the discussion in the 3D case in subsection 2.4, we can obtain the superficial degree of divergence

$$\omega = 4 - 3V_1 - 2V_2 - V_3. \tag{3.125}$$

We see that ω is suppressed by the numbers of vertex, so the 4D case is still renormalizable by power counting. However, compared to the 3D case in Eq. (2.53), ω in Eq. (3.125) is not further suppressed by the number of loops. Moreover, the renormalizability by power counting does not ensure that the theory is renormalizable. An alternative approach to analyze the effective potential is using the functional renormalization group [47–49], which does not require the theory is renormalizable in the conventional meaning. The functional renormalization group has been used to analyzing the gravity theory, in which the asymptotic safety property is expected [50–52].

In order to compute the one-loop effective action, we need to compute the determinant

$$\big[\mathrm{pdet}(\mathcal{D}_{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta})\big]^{-\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{3.126}$$

Here pdet means that we only consider the nonzero eigenvalues, because $\mathcal{D}_{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta}$ in Eq. (3.120) has one zero eigenvalue. This zero eigenvalue contributes an overall volume factor, which is hence can be removed [53, 54]. After computing the determinant of the tensor sector by considering the nonzero eigenvalues, we obtain the determinant

$$\det\Big(-\frac{1}{96}W_{1,1}\big(1+\frac{W_{1,2}}{W_{1,1}}\big)\cdot W_{2,1}\big(1+\frac{W_{2,2}}{W_{2,1}}\big)\cdot W_{3,1}\big(1+\frac{W_{3,2}}{W_{3,1}}\big)\Big). \tag{3.127}$$

In the above, $W_{1,1}$ and $W_{1,2}$ are

$$W_{1,1} = \big(\frac{1}{v}\Box+1\big)\big(\frac{1}{v}\Box+2\big)^2, \tag{3.128}$$

$$W_{1,2} = \frac{1}{2v^3}\big(\Box^2+11v\Box+14v^2\big)(n\cdot\partial)^2-\frac{1}{2v^3}\Box(n\cdot\partial)^4. \tag{3.129}$$

$W_{2,1}$ and $W_{2,2}$ are

$$W_{2,1} = \big(\frac{1}{v}\Box+b_+\big)^2\big(\frac{1}{v}\Box-b_-\big)^2, \tag{3.130}$$

$$\begin{aligned} W_{2,2} = {} & \frac{2}{v^4}\big(\Box^3+7v\Box^2+10v^2\Box-8v^3\big)(n\cdot\partial)^2 \\ & +\frac{1}{v^4}\big(\Box^2+12v\Box+16v^2\big)(n\cdot\partial)^4+\frac{4}{v^3}\Box(n\cdot\partial)^6, \end{aligned} \tag{3.131}$$

where b_+ and b_- have been given in Eq. (2.50). $W_{3,1}$ and $W_{3,2}$ are

$$W_{3,1} = \frac{1}{v^4}\big(\Box^2+8v\Box-2v^2\big)\big(\Box^2-2v^2\big)+12, \tag{3.132}$$

$$\begin{aligned} W_{3,2} = {} & \frac{4}{v^3}\big(3\Box^2+4v\Box-8v^2\big)(n\cdot\partial)^2 \\ & -\frac{2}{v^4}\big(\Box^2+2v\Box-12v^2\big)(n\cdot\partial)^4-\frac{8}{v^3}(n\cdot\partial)^6+\frac{1}{v^4}(n\cdot\partial)^8. \end{aligned} \tag{3.133}$$

$W_{3,1}$ can also be factorized as

$$W_{3,1} = \big(\frac{1}{v}\Box+r_1\big)\big(\frac{1}{v}\Box+r_2\big)\big(\frac{1}{v}\Box+z\big)\big(\frac{1}{v}\Box+\bar{z}\big), \tag{3.134}$$

where

$$r_1\approx 8.2210,\quad r_2\approx 1.7144, \tag{3.135}$$

are numerical values of real roots, and

$$z\approx -0.96772+0.44578i,\quad \bar{z}\approx -0.96772-0.44578i, \tag{3.136}$$

are a pair of conjugate complex roots. From the determinant in Eq. (3.127), the effective potential can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} V_{\text{eff}} = {} & \frac{3}{2\kappa^2}v^2-\frac{i}{2}\text{tr}\big(\log W_{1,1}+\log W_{2,1}+\log W_{3,1}\big) \\ & -\frac{i}{2}\text{tr}\Big(\log\big(1+\frac{W_{1,2}}{W_{1,1}}\big)+\log\big(1+\frac{W_{2,2}}{W_{2,1}}\big)+\log\big(1+\frac{W_{3,2}}{W_{3,1}}\big)\Big)+\cdots. \end{aligned} \tag{3.137}$$

The operators in the second line of Eq. (3.137) depend on the vector n_μ. As discussed below Eq. (3.101), n_μ can be eliminated by Eq. (3.101) after taking the trace operation, so V_{eff} shall be independent of n_μ. These operators can be computed as perturbative series, but it is difficult to obtain compact results. In this subsection, we shall only consider the contribution from the first line of Eq. (3.137). In momentum space, the first line of Eq. (3.137) can be computed as

$$V_{\text{eff}} = \frac{3}{2\kappa^2}v^2+\frac{1}{2}V_{\text{eff}}^{(1)}+\frac{1}{2}V_{\text{eff}}^{(2)}+\frac{1}{2}V_{\text{eff}}^{(3)}+\cdots. \tag{3.138}$$

In the above, the contributions from the $W_{1,1}$ and $W_{2,1}$ terms are

$$V_{\text{eff}}^{(1)} = \int \frac{d^4k_{\text{E}}}{(2\pi)^4}\Big[\log\big(\frac{1}{v}k_{\text{E}}^2+1\big)+2\log\big(\frac{1}{v}k_{\text{E}}^2+2\big)\Big], \tag{3.139}$$

$$V_{\text{eff}}^{(2)} = \int \frac{d^4k_{\text{E}}}{(2\pi)^4}\Big[2\log\big(\frac{1}{v}k_{\text{E}}^2+b_+\big)+2\log\big|\frac{1}{v}k_{\text{E}}^2-b_-\big|\Big]. \tag{3.140}$$

We see that the second term of Eq. (3.139) and the two terms of Eq. (3.140) coincide with the contributions (2.56) in 3D. The contribution from the $W_{3,1}$ term is

$$\begin{aligned} V_{\text{eff}}^{(3)} &= \int \frac{d^4k_{\text{E}}}{(2\pi)^4}\Big[\log\big(\frac{1}{v}k_{\text{E}}^2+r_1\big)+\log\big(\frac{1}{v}k_{\text{E}}^2+r_2\big)\Big], \\ &+ \int \frac{d^4k_{\text{E}}}{(2\pi)^4}\Big[\log\big(\frac{1}{v}k_{\text{E}}^2+z\big)+\log\big(\frac{1}{v}k_{\text{E}}^2+\bar{z}\big)\Big]. \end{aligned} \tag{3.141}$$

Using the dimensional regularization in appendix C, we obtain the result

$$\begin{aligned} V_{\text{eff}} &= \frac{3}{2\kappa^2}v^2-\frac{c_1}{128\pi^2}v^2-\frac{c_2}{64\pi^2}v^2\log\frac{\mu^2}{v}-\frac{c_2}{64\pi^2}v^2\big(\frac{1}{\epsilon}+\log 4\pi-\gamma_{\text{E}}\big), \\ c_1 &= s(1)+2s(2)+2s(b_+)+2s(b_-)+s(r_1)+s(r_2)+s(z)+s(\bar{z}), \\ c_2 &= 1+2\cdot 2^2+2b_+^2+2b_-^2+r_1^2+r_2^2+z^2+\bar{z}^2=133, \end{aligned} \tag{3.142}$$

where $s(x)$ is the function

$$s(x) = x^2(3-2\log x), \tag{3.143}$$

and μ is the renormalization scale. The fourth term of Eq. (3.142) can be subtracted in the minimal subtraction theme. In Eq. (2.57) for the 3D case, we know that the tachyonic term b_- vanishes. However, the tachyonic term b_- in Eq. (3.142) behaves like the other massive modes. We can define the running coupling constant $\bar{\kappa}$

$$\frac{3}{\bar{\kappa}^2} = \frac{\partial^2 V_{\text{eff}}}{\partial v^2}\Big|_{v=\bar{\mu}^2} = \frac{3}{\kappa^2}-\frac{c_1}{64\pi^2}+\frac{c_2}{64\pi^2}\big(2\log\frac{\bar{\mu}^2}{\mu^2}+3\big). \tag{3.144}$$

From this definition, we obtain the renormalization group equation for $\bar{\kappa}$

$$\bar{\mu}\frac{\partial\bar{\kappa}}{\partial\bar{\mu}} = -\frac{c_2}{96\pi^2}\bar{\kappa}^3 = -\big(3\frac{11}{24}+\frac{1}{96}\big)\frac{\bar{\kappa}^3}{\pi^2}. \tag{3.145}$$

This equation is similar to the definition of the beta function in the pure $SU(2)$ Yang-Mills theory. However, the value of this beta function is about 3 times of that in the $SU(2)$ Yang-Mills theory. This difference could be attributed to the contributions from the quadratic constraint term as we have discussed below Eq. (3.72). Note that the above results are obtained assuming that we only consider the first line of Eq. (3.137). It would be interesting to see how the beta function can be corrected by the second line of Eq. (3.137). In terms of $\bar{\kappa}$, the effective potential can be rewritten as

$$V_{\text{eff}} = \frac{3}{2\bar{\kappa}^2}v^2+\frac{c_2}{64\pi^2}v^2\big(\log\frac{v}{\bar{\mu}^2}-\frac{3}{2}\big), \tag{3.146}$$

which has the minimum value at

$$\langle v\rangle = \bar{\mu}^2\exp\big(-\frac{96\pi^2}{133\bar{\kappa}^2}+1\big). \tag{3.147}$$

This is the typical dimensional transmutation phenomenon for classically scale invariant theories.

In the end of subsection 2.4, we have discussed the effectiveness of the one-loop computation in 3D. In 3D, we found that all interactive vertices are suppressed by the dimension-2 condensate v with

no exception. In 4D, the situation is a little more complicated. In 4D, we make the redefinitions $\tilde{h}_{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{\kappa\sqrt{v}} h_{\mu\nu}$, then $\tilde{h}_{\mu\nu}$ has the canonical dimension. After this redefinition, the interactive vertices produced by Eqs. (3.37), (3.38) and (3.40) are all suppressed by v. The vertex of the lowest dimension is $\frac{\kappa}{\sqrt{v}} \tilde{h}\partial\tilde{h}\partial\tilde{h}$. These are similar to the cases in 3D. However, because the torsion is non-zero, a different point arises in the 4D case. The vertices, which only depend on κ but are not suppressed by v, could be produced by the linear torsion term (3.41). Nevertheless, using the torsion in Eq. (3.32) and the metric in Eq. (3.96), this term is exactly zero. Therefore, all interactive vertices are also suppressed by v in 4D. The effectiveness of one-loop computation is actually controlled by the effective coupling $\frac{\kappa}{\sqrt{v}}$.

In addition, we compare the above results with the magnetic instability discovered in [55]. In [55], it was discovered that the constant Savvidy background [56] is unstable due to the appearance of tachyonic modes[6]. In a series of papers [58, 59], the authors proposed that the instability can be removed by using space-time dependent backgrounds, which have the periodic structure and share similarities with a type II superconductor. In terms of the metric-like variables, we also find the tachyonic mode in Eq. (3.130). However, the tachyonic mode appears in pair, and the term associated to the tachyon mode in the functional determinant appears to be completely square, which ensures that the operator is non-negative. So the one-loop effective potential is still stable. A question is that if space-time dependent backgrounds are also stable and can even give lower vacuum energy. The answer is probably negative. The reason is that the reformulated theory is a higher derivative theory. Higher derivative theories generally suffer from the Ostrogradski instability especially when the field configurations are space-time dependent [60]. In the situation here, the space-time dependent background may break the square structure of the tachyon mode in the functional determinant, and hence may yield imaginary contributions to the effective potential. However, the analysis of this subsection do not mean that the analysis of the Savvidy instability is invalid. The Savvidy background can be expressed by the gauge field A^a_μ. The dimension-2 condensate is in terms of the frame field e^a_μ, which is basically a non-local function of A^a_μ according to the decompositions in subsections 2.1 and 3.1. In [17], the dimension-2 condensate is proposed to be expressed by a non-local operator. In [55], the authors also proposed that the stable vacuum could be reached after a cascade decay process, but the vacuum is characterized by non-local operators.

3.5 Gauge Invariant Gluon Polarization

In 4D, the gluon angular momentum operator are similar to that in Eqs. (2.60) and (2.61) in 3D. Using the variables in the subsection 3.1, we have

$$\kappa^2 M^{\mu\alpha\beta}_{gs} = -\eta^{\mu\tau}(\eta^{\alpha\theta}\eta^{\beta\gamma} - \eta^{\beta\theta}\eta^{\alpha\gamma})(\frac{1}{2}R^{\sigma}{}_{\rho\tau\theta}g^{\rho\lambda}\mathcal{E}_{\gamma\lambda\sigma} + 2\Sigma^{\rho}_{\tau\theta}g_{\rho\gamma} + \mathcal{E}_{\gamma\tau\theta}). \tag{3.148}$$

In the low momentum limit, $M^{\mu\alpha\beta}_{gs}$ shall be dominated by

$$\kappa^2 M^{\mu\alpha\beta}_{gs} \approx -2\eta^{\mu\tau}\eta^{\alpha\rho}\eta^{\beta\sigma}\mathcal{E}_{\tau\rho\sigma}. \tag{3.149}$$

The orbital angular momentum $M^{\mu\alpha\beta}_{go}$ can also be expressed by space-time tensor fields. Many results are similar to the expression in subsection 2.5. Because the torsion (3.33) is not zero, $M^{\mu\alpha\beta}_{go}$ also includes the contribution from the torsion.

For the Maxwell field, it has been shown that the Laguerre-Gaussian laser modes have a well-defined angular momentum [61, 62]. The Laguerre-Gaussian laser modes are described by classical solutions of vacuum Maxwell equations. In the above, we have given the gauge invariant expressions of the $SU(2)$ gluon angular momentum. For another different expression, see [63]. It is interesting to consider whether there exist classical solutions of the Lagrangian (3.36) which have well-defined angular momentum. The above expressions of $M^{\mu\alpha\beta}_{gs}$ and $M^{\mu\alpha\beta}_{go}$ provide appropriate variables to perform the computations.

[6] In [57], it was proposed that this instability could be eliminated by considering the gauge invariant background and the parity of the modes.

In the end of subsection 2.5, we have discussed how to solve e^a_μ as a function of A^a_μ. The results are that a solution based on the Taylor expansion can be found, and the solution is not unique. The four dimensional case is more complicated. In order to solve e^a_μ in terms of A^a_μ, we need to solve two constraints (3.45) and (3.46). A similar solution based on the Taylor series can be obtained, although the solution have more complicated expressions than the case in 3D.

4 Conclusions

We employed new variables in terms of space-time tensor fields to recast $SU(2)$ Yang-Mills theories into gravity-like formulations, which are proposed as effective descriptions of the infrared region. The gravity-like formulations include the square of Riemann curvature, which are higher derivative theories. These higher derivative theories are shown to be renormalizable by power counting. The gauge invariant metric-like variables are then used to analyze the dimension two condensate.

In 3 dimensions, the one-loop effective potential is finite, and a nonzero dimension two condensate is obtained. In 4 dimensions, the one-loop effective potential provides the dimensional transmutation phenomenon, and the beta function of running coupling is also obtained, which is negative but with numerical difference with the conventional Yang-Mills theory. Although we find tachyonic modes both in 3 and 4 dimensions, these tachyonic modes do not induce instability of the effective potential because of the special structure of kinetic terms.

In subsections 2.4 and 3.4, we discuss a new phenomenon in the reformulated theories. In Yang-Mills theories, the interaction vertices are measured by a unique coupling κ. In contrast, the interactions in the reformulated theories are controlled by effective couplings, which are functions of κ and the dimension two condensate, and the dimension two condensate has the effect of suppressing the interaction vertices. In 3 dimensions, this effect has the interpretation that the higher loop expansions are actually strong coupling expansions.

In 4 dimensions, we also discuss the additional unit 4-vector in subsection 3.3. The obtained scalar-vector sector of the Lagrangian has the property of duality between the dimension two condensate and the unit 4-vector, which provides a novel dual property of the $SU(2)$ Yang-Mills theory in 4 dimensions.

An interesting question is whether the $SU(3)$ Yang-Mills theories can also be reformulated into gravity-like formulations. In this regard, the methods used in [64–67] could be very relevant. For example, the $SU(3)$ Yang-Mills theory in 3 dimension can be straightforwardly reformulated by introducing the higher-spin field variables in [67].

Acknowledgments

This work was supported in part by Fondecyt (Chile) grant 1100287 and by Project Basal under Contract No. FB0821. We thank the tensor algebra package xAct [68] for help in the computations.

A Conventions

Because we have two metrics $\eta_{\mu\nu}$ and $g_{\mu\nu}$, the convention is that we raise up or down the tensor indices by $\eta_{\mu\nu}$ and its inverse $\eta^{\mu\nu}$. However, we claim several exceptions in this paper. $g_{\mu\nu}$ is an exception. $g^{\mu\nu}$ in section 2 is its inverse or is its generalized inverse in section 3, but is not obtained by raising up indices by $\eta^{\mu\nu}$ from $g_{\mu\nu}$. $\gamma^{\mu\nu}$ and $\mathcal{E}^{\alpha\beta\gamma}$ in section 3 are also exceptions. In most of cases, we give the summation manifestly to avoid confusions.

B Projection Operator of Propagator

In D dimensional space-time, we define the following projection operators [27]

$$P^{(2)}_{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta} = \frac{1}{2}\left(\theta_{\mu\alpha}\theta_{\nu\beta} + \theta_{\mu\beta}\theta_{\nu\alpha} - \frac{2}{D-1}\theta_{\mu\nu}\theta_{\alpha\beta}\right), \tag{B.1}$$

$$P^{(1)}_{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta} = \frac{1}{2}\left(\theta_{\mu\alpha}\omega_{\nu\beta} + \theta_{\mu\beta}\omega_{\nu\alpha} + \theta_{\nu\alpha}\omega_{\mu\beta} + \theta_{\nu\beta}\omega_{\mu\alpha}\right), \tag{B.2}$$

$$P^{(0,s)}_{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta} = \frac{1}{D-1}\theta_{\mu\nu}\theta_{\alpha\beta}, \quad P^{(0,\omega)}_{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta} = \omega_{\mu\nu}\omega_{\alpha\beta}, \tag{B.3}$$

and two additional operators

$$P^{(0,s\omega)}_{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{D-1}}\theta_{\mu\nu}\omega_{\alpha\beta}, \quad P^{(0,\omega s)}_{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{D-1}}\omega_{\mu\nu}\theta_{\alpha\beta}, \tag{B.4}$$

where in the coordinate space

$$\theta_{\mu\nu} = \eta_{\mu\nu} - \frac{\partial_\mu\partial_\nu}{\eta^{\rho\sigma}\partial_\rho\partial_\sigma}, \quad \omega_{\mu\nu} = \frac{\partial_\mu\partial_\nu}{\eta^{\rho\sigma}\partial_\rho\partial_\sigma}, \tag{B.5}$$

or in the momentum space

$$\theta_{\mu\nu} = \eta_{\mu\nu} - \frac{k_\mu k_\nu}{\eta^{\rho\sigma}k_\rho k_\sigma}, \quad \omega_{\mu\nu} = \frac{k_\mu k_\nu}{\eta^{\rho\sigma}k_\rho k_\sigma}. \tag{B.6}$$

C Calculation by Dimensional Regularization

We calculate the integral in n dimensions

$$\int \frac{d^n k_{\rm E}}{(2\pi)^3}\log\left(ak_{\rm E}^2 + b\right) = \frac{\pi^{\frac{n}{2}}}{(2\pi)^n\Gamma(\frac{n}{2})}a^{-\frac{n}{2}}\int_0^\infty du\ u^{\frac{n-2}{2}}\log(u+b), \tag{C.1}$$

where we suppose $a > 0$ and $b > 0$. If we define [29]

$$f(\alpha) = -\int_0^\infty du\ u^{\frac{n-2}{2}}\frac{1}{(u+b)^\alpha}, \tag{C.2}$$

then we have

$$f'(0) = \int_0^\infty du\ u^{\frac{n-2}{2}}\log(u+b), \quad f'(\alpha) = \frac{df}{d\alpha}. \tag{C.3}$$

The integral $f(\alpha)$ can be computed to be

$$\begin{aligned} f(\alpha) &= -\frac{2}{n}b^{\frac{n}{2}-\alpha}\left(\frac{u}{u+b}\right)^{\frac{n}{2}}{}_2F_1\left(\frac{n}{2}, 1+\frac{n}{2}-\alpha; 1+\frac{n}{2}, \frac{u}{u+b}\right)\Big|_0^\infty \\ &= -b^{\frac{n}{2}-\alpha}\frac{\Gamma(\frac{n}{2})\Gamma(\alpha-\frac{n}{2})}{\Gamma(\alpha)}, \end{aligned} \tag{C.4}$$

which yields

$$f'(0) = -b^{\frac{n}{2}}\Gamma(\frac{n}{2})\Gamma(-\frac{n}{2}). \tag{C.5}$$

Another type of integral is

$$\int \frac{d^n k_{\rm E}}{(2\pi)^3}\log|ak_{\rm E}^2 - b| = \frac{\pi^{\frac{n}{2}}}{(2\pi)^n\Gamma(\frac{n}{2})}a^{-\frac{n}{2}}\int_0^\infty du\ u^{\frac{n-2}{2}}\log|u-b|. \tag{C.6}$$

The abstract sign can be removed by

$$\int_0^\infty du\ u^{\frac{n-2}{2}}\log|u-b| = \int_0^b du\ u^{\frac{n-2}{2}}\log(b-u) + \int_b^\infty du\ u^{\frac{n-2}{2}}\log(u-b). \tag{C.7}$$

If we define

$$f_1(\alpha) = -\int_0^b du\ u^{\frac{n-2}{2}}\frac{1}{(b-u)^\alpha}, \tag{C.8}$$

$$f_2(\alpha) = -\int_b^\infty du\ u^{\frac{n-2}{2}}\frac{1}{(u-b)^\alpha} = -\int_0^\infty du\ (u+b)^{\frac{n-2}{2}}\frac{1}{u^\alpha}, \tag{C.9}$$

then we have

$$f_1(\alpha) = -\frac{2}{n}u^{\frac{n}{2}}b^{-\alpha}{}_2F_1\big(\frac{n}{2},\alpha;1+\frac{n}{2},\frac{u}{b}\big)\big|_0^\infty = -b^{\frac{n}{2}-\alpha}\frac{\Gamma(\frac{n}{2})\Gamma(1-\alpha)}{\Gamma(1+\frac{n}{2}-\alpha)}, \tag{C.10}$$

$$\begin{aligned} f_2(\alpha) &= \frac{1}{\alpha-1}b^{\frac{n}{2}-\alpha}\bigg(\frac{u}{u+b}\bigg)^{1-\alpha}{}_2F_1\big(1+\frac{n}{2}-\alpha,1-\alpha;2-\alpha,\frac{u}{u+b}\big)\big|_0^\infty \\ &= -b^{\frac{n}{2}-\alpha}\frac{\Gamma(1-\alpha)\Gamma(\alpha-\frac{n}{2})}{\Gamma(1-\frac{n}{2})}. \end{aligned} \tag{C.11}$$

From the above, we further obtain

$$f_1'(0) = \frac{2b^{\frac{n}{2}}}{n}\big[\log(b)-\gamma_{\rm E}-\psi^{(0)}(1+\frac{n}{2})\big], \tag{C.12}$$

$$f_2'(0) = -\frac{2b^{\frac{n}{2}}}{n}\big[\log(b)-\gamma_{\rm E}-\psi^{(0)}(-\frac{n}{2})\big], \tag{C.13}$$

where

$$\psi^{(0)}(z) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(z)}\frac{d\Gamma(z)}{dz} \tag{C.14}$$

is the poly gamma function and $\gamma_{\rm E}$ is the Euler gamma constant.

D Property of Projection Tensor

As we have mentioned in section 3, the tensors $(\delta^\alpha_\beta - n^\alpha_\beta)$ and n^α_β behave like projection tensors. Using the definition (3.8), we can prove that they have the properties

$$n^\alpha_\sigma n^\sigma_\beta = n^\alpha_\beta, \quad (\delta^\alpha_\sigma - n^\alpha_\sigma)(\delta^\sigma_\beta - n^\sigma_\beta) = (\delta^\alpha_\beta - n^\alpha_\beta), \quad n^\alpha_\sigma(\delta^\sigma_\beta - n^\sigma_\beta) = 0. \tag{D.1}$$

Acting on the metric $g_{\alpha\beta}$, they yield

$$n^\sigma_\alpha g_{\sigma\beta} = g_{\alpha\beta}, \quad (\delta^\sigma_\alpha - n^\sigma_\alpha)g_{\sigma\beta} = 0. \tag{D.2}$$

Similarly, acting on the generalized inverse metric $g^{\alpha\beta}$, they yield

$$n^\alpha_\sigma g^{\sigma\beta} = g^{\alpha\beta}, \quad (\delta^\alpha_\sigma - n^\alpha_\sigma)g^{\sigma\beta} = 0. \tag{D.3}$$

$(\delta^\alpha_\beta - n^\alpha_\beta)$ and n^α_β can also be used to decompose tensors. For example, for the tensor $\Sigma^\rho_{\alpha\beta}$, we have the identity

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma^\rho_{\alpha\beta} &= n^\sigma_\alpha n^\tau_\beta n^\rho_\theta \Sigma^\theta_{\sigma\tau} + n^\sigma_\alpha n^\tau_\beta(\delta^\rho_\theta - n^\rho_\theta)\Sigma^\theta_{\sigma\tau} + n^\sigma_\alpha(\delta^\tau_\beta - n^\tau_\beta)n^\rho_\theta\Sigma^\theta_{\sigma\tau} \\ &+ n^\sigma_\alpha(\delta^\tau_\beta - n^\tau_\beta)(\delta^\rho_\theta - n^\rho_\theta)\Sigma^\theta_{\sigma\tau} + (\delta^\sigma_\alpha - n^\sigma_\alpha)n^\tau_\beta n^\rho_\theta\Sigma^\theta_{\sigma\tau} + (\delta^\sigma_\alpha - n^\sigma_\alpha)n^\tau_\beta(\delta^\rho_\theta - n^\rho_\theta)\Sigma^\theta_{\sigma\tau} \\ &+ (\delta^\sigma_\alpha - n^\sigma_\alpha)(\delta^\tau_\beta - n^\tau_\beta)n^\rho_\theta\Sigma^\theta_{\sigma\tau} + (\delta^\sigma_\alpha - n^\sigma_\alpha)(\delta^\tau_\beta - n^\tau_\beta)(\delta^\rho_\theta - n^\rho_\theta)\Sigma^\theta_{\sigma\tau}, \end{aligned} \tag{D.4}$$

that is, $\Sigma^\rho_{\alpha\beta}$ has 8 different parts under the projection decomposition. The above discussions are useful to find solutions of connection with metric compatibility.

E Solution of Connection in 4 Dimensions

In this appendix, we give the procedure to solve Eq. (3.25). We attempt to find a connection which satisfies

$$\partial_\mu g_{\alpha\beta} = \Gamma^\rho_{\mu\alpha} g_{\rho\beta} + \Gamma^\rho_{\mu\beta} g_{\rho\alpha} \tag{E.1}$$

From Eq. (E.1), we have

$$\Gamma_{\sigma,\alpha\beta} = \Gamma^\rho_{(\alpha\beta)} g_{\rho\sigma} + \Sigma^\rho_{\alpha\sigma} g_{\rho\beta} + \Sigma^\rho_{\beta\sigma} g_{\rho\alpha}, \tag{E.2}$$

where $\Gamma^\rho_{(\alpha\beta)} = \frac{1}{2}(\Gamma^\rho_{\alpha\beta} + \Gamma^\rho_{\beta\alpha})$ is the symmetric part of the connection and $\Sigma^\rho_{\alpha\beta} = \frac{1}{2}(\Gamma^\rho_{\alpha\beta} - \Gamma^\rho_{\beta\alpha})$ is its antisymmetric part. $\Gamma_{\sigma,\alpha\beta}$ has been defined in Eq. (3.33). From Eq. (E.2), we have

$$\Gamma^\rho_{(\alpha\beta)} n^\sigma_\rho = g^{\sigma\rho}\Gamma_{\rho,\alpha\beta} - g^{\sigma\tau}(\Sigma^\rho_{\alpha\tau} g_{\rho\beta} + \Sigma^\rho_{\beta\tau} g_{\rho\alpha}). \tag{E.3}$$

Because we have the decomposition

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma^\sigma_{\alpha\beta} &= \Gamma^\sigma_{(\alpha\beta)} + \Sigma^\sigma_{\alpha\beta} = \Gamma^\rho_{(\alpha\beta)} n^\sigma_\rho + \Gamma^\rho_{(\alpha\beta)}(\delta^\sigma_\rho - n^\sigma_\rho) + \Sigma^\sigma_{\alpha\beta} \\ &= g^{\sigma\rho}\Gamma_{\rho,\alpha\beta} - g^{\sigma\tau}(\Sigma^\rho_{\alpha\tau} g_{\rho\beta} + \Sigma^\rho_{\beta\tau} g_{\rho\alpha}) + \Gamma^\rho_{(\alpha\beta)}(\delta^\sigma_\rho - n^\sigma_\rho) + \Sigma^\sigma_{\alpha\beta}.\end{aligned} \tag{E.4}$$

We have used Eq. (E.3) to replace the part $\Gamma^\rho_{(\alpha\beta)} n^\sigma_\rho$ of $\Gamma^\sigma_{\alpha\beta}$. Substituting Eq. (E.4) into Eq. (E.2), we find that Eq. (E.2) is satisfied if

$$(\delta^\rho_\sigma - n^\rho_\sigma)\Gamma_{\rho,\alpha\beta} = (\delta^\tau_\sigma - n^\tau_\sigma)(\Sigma^\rho_{\alpha\tau} g_{\rho\beta} + \Sigma^\rho_{\beta\tau} g_{\rho\alpha}). \tag{E.5}$$

We can check that Eqs. (E.5) and (E.3) make Eq. (E.1) satisfied. Multiplying the two sides of Eq. (E.5) by the projection tensor $(\delta^\alpha_\theta - n^\alpha_\theta)$, we have

$$(\delta^\alpha_\theta - n^\alpha_\theta)(\delta^\rho_\sigma - n^\rho_\sigma)\Gamma_{\rho,\alpha\beta} = (\delta^\alpha_\theta - n^\alpha_\theta)(\delta^\tau_\sigma - n^\tau_\sigma)\Sigma^\rho_{\alpha\tau} g_{\rho\beta}, \tag{E.6}$$

which means

$$(\delta^\alpha_\theta - n^\alpha_\theta)(\delta^\tau_\sigma - n^\tau_\sigma)\Sigma^\rho_{\alpha\tau} n^\lambda_\rho = (\delta^\alpha_\theta - n^\alpha_\theta)(\delta^\rho_\sigma - n^\rho_\sigma) g^{\lambda\beta}\Gamma_{\rho,\alpha\beta}, \tag{E.7}$$

From Eq. (E.5), we also have

$$(\delta^\rho_\sigma - n^\rho_\sigma) n^\theta_\alpha n^\tau_\beta \Gamma_{\rho,\theta\tau} = (\delta^\tau_\sigma - n^\tau_\sigma)(n^\theta_\alpha \Sigma^\rho_{\theta\tau} g_{\rho\beta} + n^\theta_\beta \Sigma^\rho_{\theta\tau} g_{\rho\alpha}). \tag{E.8}$$

We have the decomposition

$$\begin{aligned}(\delta^\tau_\sigma - n^\tau_\sigma) n^\theta_\alpha \Sigma^\rho_{\theta\tau} g_{\rho\beta} &= \frac{1}{2}(\delta^\tau_\sigma - n^\tau_\sigma)(n^\theta_\alpha \Sigma^\rho_{\theta\tau} g_{\rho\beta} + n^\theta_\beta \Sigma^\rho_{\theta\tau} g_{\rho\alpha}) \\ &+ \frac{1}{2}(\delta^\tau_\sigma - n^\tau_\sigma)(n^\theta_\alpha \Sigma^\rho_{\theta\tau} g_{\rho\beta} - n^\theta_\beta \Sigma^\rho_{\theta\tau} g_{\rho\alpha}).\end{aligned} \tag{E.9}$$

Using Eq. (E.8) to replace the symmetrical part of Eq. (E.9), then from Eq. (E.9), we can obtain

$$\begin{aligned}(\delta^\tau_\sigma - n^\tau_\sigma) n^\theta_\alpha \Sigma^\rho_{\theta\tau} n^\beta_\rho &= \frac{1}{2}(\delta^\rho_\sigma - n^\rho_\sigma) n^\theta_\alpha g^{\beta\tau}\Gamma_{\rho,\theta\tau} \\ &+ \frac{1}{2}(\delta^\tau_\sigma - n^\tau_\sigma)(n^\theta_\alpha \Sigma^\rho_{\theta\tau} n^\beta_\rho - g^{\beta\theta}\Sigma^\rho_{\theta\tau} g_{\rho\alpha}).\end{aligned} \tag{E.10}$$

Eqs. (E.7) and (E.10) together yield

$$\begin{aligned}(\delta^\tau_\mu - n^\tau_\mu)\Sigma^\rho_{\alpha\tau} n^\sigma_\rho &= (\delta^\tau_\mu - n^\tau_\mu)(\delta^\theta_\alpha - n^\theta_\alpha)\Sigma^\rho_{\theta\tau} n^\sigma_\rho + (\delta^\tau_\mu - n^\tau_\mu) n^\theta_\alpha \Sigma^\rho_{\theta\tau} n^\sigma_\rho \\ &= (\delta^\theta_\alpha - n^\theta_\alpha)(\delta^\rho_\mu - n^\rho_\mu) g^{\sigma\tau}\Gamma_{\rho,\theta\tau} + \frac{1}{2}(\delta^\rho_\mu - n^\rho_\mu) n^\theta_\alpha g^{\sigma\tau}\Gamma_{\rho,\theta\tau} \\ &+ \frac{1}{2}(\delta^\tau_\mu - n^\tau_\mu)(n^\theta_\alpha \Sigma^\rho_{\theta\tau} n^\sigma_\rho - g^{\sigma\theta}\Sigma^\rho_{\theta\tau} g_{\rho\alpha}),\end{aligned} \tag{E.11}$$

which further yields

$$\begin{aligned}\Sigma^{\sigma}_{\alpha\mu} &= (\delta^{\tau}_{\mu}-n^{\tau}_{\mu})\Sigma^{\rho}_{\alpha\tau}n^{\sigma}_{\rho}+(\delta^{\tau}_{\mu}-n^{\tau}_{\mu})\Sigma^{\rho}_{\alpha\tau}(\delta^{\sigma}_{\rho}-n^{\sigma}_{\rho})+n^{\tau}_{\mu}\Sigma^{\sigma}_{\alpha\tau}\\ &= (\delta^{\theta}_{\alpha}-n^{\theta}_{\alpha})(\delta^{\rho}_{\mu}-n^{\rho}_{\mu})g^{\sigma\tau}\Gamma_{\rho,\theta\tau}+\frac{1}{2}(\delta^{\rho}_{\mu}-n^{\rho}_{\mu})n^{\theta}_{\alpha}g^{\sigma\tau}\Gamma_{\rho,\theta\tau}\\ &+\frac{1}{2}(\delta^{\tau}_{\mu}-n^{\tau}_{\mu})(n^{\theta}_{\alpha}\Sigma^{\rho}_{\theta\tau}n^{\sigma}_{\rho}-g^{\sigma\theta}\Sigma^{\rho}_{\theta\tau}g_{\rho\alpha})+(\delta^{\tau}_{\mu}-n^{\tau}_{\mu})\Sigma^{\rho}_{\alpha\tau}(\delta^{\sigma}_{\rho}-n^{\sigma}_{\rho})+n^{\tau}_{\mu}\Sigma^{\sigma}_{\alpha\tau}.\end{aligned}\tag{E.12}$$

Using the expression (E.12), and the identity

$$(\delta^{\rho}_{\sigma}-n^{\rho}_{\sigma})(\delta^{\theta}_{\alpha}-n^{\theta}_{\alpha})(n^{\tau}_{\beta}-n^{\tau}_{\beta})\Gamma_{\rho,\theta\tau}=0,\tag{E.13}$$

we can prove that Eq. (E.5) is satisfied. $\Sigma^{\sigma}_{\alpha\mu}$ is antisymmetric about α and μ, but the expression of Eq. (E.12) is not. However, multiplying the two sides of Eq. (E.12) by $(\delta^{\tau}_{\mu}-n^{\tau}_{\mu})$ and n^{θ}_{α}, we have

$$\begin{aligned}(\delta^{\tau}_{\mu}-n^{\tau}_{\mu})n^{\theta}_{\alpha}\Sigma^{\sigma}_{\theta\tau} &= \frac{1}{2}(\delta^{\rho}_{\mu}-n^{\rho}_{\mu})n^{\theta}_{\alpha}g^{\sigma\tau}\Gamma_{\rho,\theta\tau}+(\delta^{\tau}_{\mu}-n^{\tau}_{\mu})n^{\theta}_{\alpha}\Sigma^{\rho}_{\theta\tau}(\delta^{\sigma}_{\rho}-n^{\sigma}_{\rho})\\ &+\frac{1}{2}(\delta^{\tau}_{\mu}-n^{\tau}_{\mu})(n^{\theta}_{\alpha}\Sigma^{\rho}_{\theta\tau}n^{\sigma}_{\rho}-g^{\sigma\theta}\Sigma^{\rho}_{\theta\tau}g_{\rho\alpha}).\end{aligned}\tag{E.14}$$

Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned}(\delta^{\tau}_{\mu}-n^{\tau}_{\mu})(\delta^{\theta}_{\alpha}-n^{\theta}_{\alpha})\Sigma^{\sigma}_{\theta\tau} &= (\delta^{\theta}_{\alpha}-n^{\theta}_{\alpha})(\delta^{\rho}_{\mu}-n^{\rho}_{\mu})g^{\sigma\tau}\Gamma_{\rho,\theta\tau}\\ &+(\delta^{\tau}_{\mu}-n^{\tau}_{\mu})(\delta^{\theta}_{\alpha}-n^{\theta}_{\alpha})\Sigma^{\rho}_{\theta\tau}(\delta^{\sigma}_{\rho}-n^{\sigma}_{\rho}).\end{aligned}\tag{E.15}$$

We have decomposition

$$\Sigma^{\sigma}_{\alpha\mu}=n^{\theta}_{\alpha}(\delta^{\tau}_{\mu}-n^{\tau}_{\mu})\Sigma^{\sigma}_{\theta\tau}+(\delta^{\theta}_{\alpha}-n^{\theta}_{\alpha})(\delta^{\tau}_{\mu}-n^{\tau}_{\mu})\Sigma^{\sigma}_{\theta\tau}+n^{\theta}_{\alpha}n^{\tau}_{\mu}\Sigma^{\sigma}_{\theta\tau}+(\delta^{\theta}_{\alpha}-n^{\theta}_{\alpha})n^{\tau}_{\mu}\Sigma^{\sigma}_{\theta\tau},\tag{E.16}$$

whose right side is transparently antisymmetric about α and μ. Substituting Eqs. (E.14) and (E.15) into the above decomposition, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Sigma^{\sigma}_{\alpha\mu} &= \frac{1}{2}(\delta^{\tau}_{\mu}-n^{\tau}_{\mu})g^{\sigma\rho}\Gamma_{\tau,\rho\alpha}-\frac{1}{2}(\delta^{\tau}_{\alpha}-n^{\tau}_{\alpha})g^{\sigma\rho}\Gamma_{\tau,\rho\mu}\\ &+\frac{1}{2}(\delta^{\tau}_{\mu}-n^{\tau}_{\mu})(n^{\theta}_{\alpha}\Sigma^{\rho}_{\theta\tau}n^{\sigma}_{\rho}-g^{\sigma\theta}\Sigma^{\rho}_{\theta\tau}g_{\rho\alpha})-\frac{1}{2}(\delta^{\tau}_{\alpha}-n^{\tau}_{\alpha})(n^{\theta}_{\mu}\Sigma^{\rho}_{\theta\tau}n^{\sigma}_{\rho}-g^{\sigma\theta}\Sigma^{\rho}_{\theta\tau}g_{\rho\mu})\\ &+(\delta^{\tau}_{\mu}-n^{\tau}_{\mu})n^{\theta}_{\alpha}\Sigma^{\rho}_{\theta\tau}(\delta^{\sigma}_{\rho}-n^{\sigma}_{\rho})-(\delta^{\tau}_{\alpha}-n^{\tau}_{\alpha})n^{\theta}_{\mu}\Sigma^{\rho}_{\theta\tau}(\delta^{\sigma}_{\rho}-n^{\sigma}_{\rho})\\ &+(\delta^{\tau}_{\mu}-n^{\tau}_{\mu})(\delta^{\theta}_{\alpha}-n^{\theta}_{\alpha})\Sigma^{\rho}_{\theta\tau}(\delta^{\sigma}_{\rho}-n^{\sigma}_{\rho})+n^{\tau}_{\mu}n^{\theta}_{\alpha}\Sigma^{\sigma}_{\theta\tau}.\end{aligned}\tag{E.17}$$

The right side of this expression is antisymmetric about α and μ, and we can check that $\Sigma^{\sigma}_{\alpha\mu}$ given by Eq. (E.17) satisfies Eq. (E.5).

In the above, we have obtained the connection which satisfies the metric compatibility condition (E.1). Now we further require that the connection satisfies

$$\partial_{\mu}g^{\alpha\beta}=-\Gamma^{\beta}_{\mu\rho}g^{\rho\alpha}-\Gamma^{\alpha}_{\mu\rho}g^{\rho\beta}.\tag{E.18}$$

If $g_{\alpha\beta}$ is invertible, then we can derive Eq. (E.18) from Eq. (E.1). However, $g_{\alpha\beta}$ is not invertible here. We also need to solve Eq. (E.18). Using the projection tensor, from Eq. (E.18), we have

$$(\delta^{\alpha}_{\sigma}-n^{\alpha}_{\sigma})\Gamma^{\sigma}_{\mu\rho}g^{\rho\beta}=-(\delta^{\alpha}_{\sigma}-n^{\alpha}_{\sigma})\partial_{\mu}g^{\sigma\beta},\tag{E.19}$$

which further yields

$$(\delta^{\alpha}_{\sigma}-n^{\alpha}_{\sigma})\Gamma^{\sigma}_{\mu\rho}n^{\rho}_{\beta}=-n^{\sigma}_{\beta}\partial_{\mu}n^{\alpha}_{\sigma},\tag{E.20}$$

which is equivalent to

$$(\delta^{\alpha}_{\sigma}-n^{\alpha}_{\sigma})\Gamma^{\sigma}_{(\mu\rho)}n^{\rho}_{\beta}=-(\delta^{\alpha}_{\sigma}-n^{\alpha}_{\sigma})\Sigma^{\sigma}_{\mu\rho}n^{\rho}_{\beta}-n^{\sigma}_{\beta}\partial_{\mu}n^{\alpha}_{\sigma}.\tag{E.21}$$

we can derive Eq. (E.18) from Eqs. (E.1) and (E.20). So Eq. (E.18) provides a new constraint (E.20) for the connection (E.4). From Eqs. (E.20) and (E.21), we can obtain

$$n^\tau_\alpha n^\theta_\beta \Gamma^\rho_{(\tau\theta)}(\delta^\sigma_\rho - n^\sigma_\rho) = -\frac{1}{2} n^\tau_\alpha n^\theta_\beta (\partial_\tau n^\sigma_\theta + \partial_\theta n^\sigma_\tau), \tag{E.22}$$

$$n^\tau_\alpha n^\theta_\beta \Sigma^\rho_{\tau\theta}(\delta^\sigma_\rho - n^\sigma_\rho) = -\frac{1}{2} n^\tau_\alpha n^\theta_\beta (\partial_\tau n^\sigma_\theta - \partial_\theta n^\sigma_\tau), \tag{E.23}$$

$$(\delta^\tau_\alpha - n^\tau_\alpha) n^\theta_\beta \Gamma^\rho_{(\tau\theta)}(\delta^\sigma_\rho - n^\sigma_\rho) = -(\delta^\tau_\alpha - n^\tau_\alpha) n^\theta_\beta \Sigma^\rho_{\tau\theta}(\delta^\sigma_\rho - n^\sigma_\rho) - (\delta^\tau_\alpha - n^\tau_\alpha) n^\theta_\beta \partial_\tau n^\sigma_\theta. \tag{E.24}$$

Inversely, Eqs. (E.22), (E.23) and (E.24) make Eq. (E.20) satisfied. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\Gamma^\rho_{(\alpha\mu)}(\delta^\sigma_\rho - n^\sigma_\rho) &= n^\tau_\mu \Gamma^\rho_{(\alpha\tau)}(\delta^\sigma_\rho - n^\sigma_\rho) + n^\theta_\alpha (\delta^\tau_\mu - n^\tau_\mu)\Gamma^\rho_{(\theta\tau)}(\delta^\sigma_\rho - n^\sigma_\rho) \\
&\quad + (\delta^\theta_\alpha - n^\theta_\alpha)(\delta^\tau_\mu - n^\tau_\mu)\Gamma^\rho_{\theta\tau}(\delta^\sigma_\rho - n^\sigma_\rho) \\
&= -n^\rho_\mu \partial_\alpha n^\beta_\rho - (\delta^\tau_\mu - n^\tau_\mu) n^\rho_\alpha \partial_\tau n^\beta_\rho - n^\theta_\mu \Sigma^\rho_{\alpha\theta}(\delta^\sigma_\rho - n^\sigma_\rho) \\
&\quad - (\delta^\tau_\mu - n^\tau_\mu) n^\theta_\alpha \Sigma^\rho_{\tau\theta}(\delta^\sigma_\rho - n^\sigma_\rho) + (\delta^\theta_\alpha - n^\theta_\alpha)(\delta^\tau_\mu - n^\tau_\mu)\Gamma^\rho_{(\theta\tau)}(\delta^\sigma_\rho - n^\sigma_\rho),
\end{aligned} \tag{E.25}$$

where we have used Eqs. (E.21) and (E.24). Using Eq. (E.23), $n^\theta_\mu \Sigma^\rho_{\alpha\theta}(\delta^\sigma_\rho - n^\sigma_\rho)$ and $n^\tau_\alpha n^\theta_\mu \Sigma^\rho_{\alpha\theta}$ can be decomposed as

$$\begin{aligned}
n^\theta_\mu \Sigma^\rho_{\alpha\theta}(\delta^\sigma_\rho - n^\sigma_\rho) &= n^\tau_\alpha n^\theta_\mu \Sigma^\rho_{\tau\theta}(\delta^\sigma_\rho - n^\sigma_\rho) + (\delta^\tau_\alpha - n^\tau_\alpha) n^\theta_\mu \Sigma^\rho_{\tau\theta}(\delta^\sigma_\rho - n^\sigma_\rho) \\
&= -\frac{1}{2} n^\tau_\alpha n^\theta_\mu (\partial_\tau n^\sigma_\theta - \partial_\tau n^\sigma_\theta) + (\delta^\tau_\alpha - n^\tau_\alpha) n^\theta_\mu \Sigma^\rho_{\tau\theta}(\delta^\sigma_\rho - n^\sigma_\rho),
\end{aligned} \tag{E.26}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
n^\tau_\alpha n^\theta_\mu \Sigma^\sigma_{\tau\theta} &= n^\tau_\alpha n^\theta_\mu \Sigma^\rho_{\tau\theta}(\delta^\sigma_\rho - n^\sigma_\rho) + n^\tau_\alpha n^\theta_\mu \Sigma^\rho_{\tau\theta} n^\sigma_\rho \\
&= -\frac{1}{2} n^\tau_\alpha n^\theta_\mu (\partial_\tau n^\sigma_\theta - \partial_\tau n^\sigma_\theta) + n^\tau_\alpha n^\theta_\mu \Sigma^\rho_{\tau\theta} n^\sigma_\rho.
\end{aligned} \tag{E.27}$$

Substituting Eq. (E.26) into (E.25), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\Gamma^\rho_{(\alpha\mu)}(\delta^\sigma_\rho - n^\sigma_\rho) &= -(n^\rho_\mu \partial_\alpha n^\sigma_\rho + n^\rho_\alpha \partial_\mu n^\sigma_\rho) + \frac{1}{2} n^\tau_\alpha n^\theta_\mu (\partial_\tau n^\sigma_\theta + \partial_\theta n^\sigma_\tau) \\
&\quad - (\delta^\tau_\alpha - n^\tau_\alpha) n^\theta_\mu \Sigma^\rho_{\tau\theta}(\delta^\sigma_\rho - n^\sigma_\rho) - (\delta^\tau_\mu - n^\tau_\mu) n^\theta_\alpha \Sigma^\rho_{\tau\theta}(\delta^\sigma_\rho - n^\sigma_\rho) \\
&\quad + (\delta^\theta_\alpha - n^\theta_\alpha)(\delta^\tau_\mu - n^\tau_\mu)\Gamma^\rho_{(\theta\tau)}(\delta^\sigma_\rho - n^\sigma_\rho).
\end{aligned} \tag{E.28}$$

Substituting Eq. (E.27) into (E.17), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\Sigma^\sigma_{\alpha\mu} &= \frac{1}{2}(\delta^\tau_\mu - n^\tau_\mu) g^{\sigma\rho} \Gamma_{\tau,\rho\alpha} - \frac{1}{2}(\delta^\tau_\alpha - n^\tau_\alpha) g^{\sigma\rho} \Gamma_{\tau,\rho\mu} - \frac{1}{2} n^\tau_\alpha n^\theta_\mu (\partial_\tau n^\sigma_\theta - \partial_\theta n^\sigma_\tau) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2}(\delta^\tau_\mu - n^\tau_\mu)(n^\theta_\alpha \Sigma^\rho_{\theta\tau} n^\sigma_\rho - g^{\sigma\theta} \Sigma^\rho_{\theta\tau} g_{\rho\alpha}) - \frac{1}{2}(\delta^\tau_\alpha - n^\tau_\alpha)(n^\theta_\mu \Sigma^\rho_{\theta\tau} n^\sigma_\rho - g^{\sigma\theta} \Sigma^\rho_{\theta\tau} g_{\rho\mu}) \\
&\quad + (\delta^\tau_\mu - n^\tau_\mu) n^\theta_\alpha \Sigma^\rho_{\theta\tau}(\delta^\sigma_\rho - n^\sigma_\rho) - (\delta^\tau_\alpha - n^\tau_\alpha) n^\theta_\mu \Sigma^\rho_{\theta\tau}(\delta^\sigma_\rho - n^\sigma_\rho) \\
&\quad + (\delta^\tau_\mu - n^\tau_\mu)(\delta^\theta_\alpha - n^\theta_\alpha) \Sigma^\rho_{\theta\tau}(\delta^\sigma_\rho - n^\sigma_\rho) + n^\tau_\mu n^\theta_\alpha \Sigma^\rho_{\theta\tau} n^\sigma_\rho.
\end{aligned} \tag{E.29}$$

Substituting (E.28) and (E.29) into Eq. (E.4), we then obtain the connection $\Gamma^\sigma_{\alpha\beta}$ which satisfies both Eqs. (E.1) and (E.18). The connection $\Gamma^\sigma_{\alpha\beta}$ with the expressions (E.28) and (E.29) is the most general solution of Eqs. (E.1) and (E.18). When $n^\theta_\alpha = \delta^\theta_\alpha$, this solution reduces to the conventional metric-compatible connection with torsion.

We give some comments on our above discussions. The basic method which we used to solve Eqs. (E.1) and (E.18) is: At first we use the projection tensor n^θ_α and $(\delta^\theta_\alpha - n^\theta_\alpha)$ to decompose the connection and the torsion, such as, the torsion is decomposed into 8 different parts in Eq. (D.4); Then some parts can be determined from Eqs. (E.1) and (E.18), and the unconstrained parts are left free. Using this method, we were able to find the most general solution of Eqs. (E.1) and (E.18). If we set the unconstrained part to be zero, then we obtain the special solutions in Eqs. (3.31) and (3.32) in subsection 3.1.

There were relevant discussions to find the metric-compatible connection for a degenerate metric. For a different definition of the metric-compatibility condition and the solution of connection, see [69]. For a review about the degenerate metric from the mathematical aspect, see [70]. For a recent discussion of the degenerate metric related to the Newton-Cartan geometry and the Galilean symmetry, see [71].

F Derivation of Generalized Inverse Matrix by Cayley-Hamilton Theorem

For a $n \times n$ matrix A, the Cayley-Hamilton theorem asserts that A satisfy the following matrix identity

$$A^n + e_1 A^{n-1} + \cdots + e_n I = 0, \tag{F.1}$$

in which I is the $n \times n$ identity matrix. The coefficients e_m are given as [72]

$$e_m = \frac{(-1)^m}{m!} \det \begin{pmatrix} \mathrm{tr}A & m-1 & 0 & \cdots & \\ \mathrm{tr}A^2 & \mathrm{tr}A & m-2 & \cdots & \\ \vdots & \vdots & & & \vdots \\ \mathrm{tr}A^{m-1} & \mathrm{tr}A^{m-2} & \cdots & \cdots & 1 \\ \mathrm{tr}A^m & \mathrm{tr}A^{m-1} & \cdots & \cdots & \mathrm{tr}A \end{pmatrix}. \tag{F.2}$$

In this appendix, we use the Cayley-Hamilton Theorem to derive the generalized inverse of $g_{\mu\nu}$. We first define the matrix

$$X^\alpha_\beta = \eta^{\alpha\rho} g_{\rho\beta}. \tag{F.3}$$

We can define the matrix S^α_β as

$$S^\alpha_\beta = \frac{1}{e_3}(X^\alpha_\rho X^\rho_\beta - X^\rho_\rho X^\alpha_\beta) + \frac{e_2}{e_3 \cdot e_3}(X^\alpha_\rho X^\rho_\sigma X^\sigma_\beta - X^\rho_\rho X^\alpha_\sigma X^\sigma_\beta) + \frac{e_2 \cdot e_2}{e_3 \cdot e_3} X^\alpha_\beta, \tag{F.4}$$

where e_2 and e_3 can be computed from Eq. (F.2) as

$$e_2 = \frac{1}{2}(X^\rho_\rho X^\sigma_\sigma - X^\rho_\sigma X^\sigma_\rho), \tag{F.5}$$

$$e_3 = \frac{1}{6}(X^\tau_\tau X^\rho_\rho X^\sigma_\sigma - 3X^\rho_\rho X^\tau_\sigma X^\sigma_\tau + 2X^\tau_\rho X^\rho_\sigma X^\sigma_\tau). \tag{F.6}$$

We can check that the following relations hold

$$X^\alpha_\rho S^\rho_\sigma X^\sigma_\beta = X^\alpha_\beta, \quad S^\alpha_\rho X^\rho_\sigma S^\sigma_\beta = S^\alpha_\beta, \tag{F.7}$$

which mean that S^α_β is the generalized inverse matrix of X^α_β. We further define

$$g^{\alpha\beta} = S^\alpha_\rho \eta^{\rho\beta}, \tag{F.8}$$

then $g^{\alpha\beta}$ is the generalized inverse matrix of $g_{\alpha\beta}$.

References

[1] L. Faddeev and A. J. Niemi, "Partially dual variables in SU(2) Yang-Mills theory," *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82** (1999) 1624–1627, arXiv:hep-th/9807069 [hep-th].

[2] S. V. Shabanov, "An Effective action for monopoles and knot solitons in Yang-Mills theory," *Phys. Lett.* **B 458** (1999) 322–330, arXiv:hep-th/9903223 [hep-th].

[3] H. Gies, "Wilsonian effective action for SU(2) Yang-Mills theory with Cho-Faddeev-Niemi-Shabanov decomposition," *Phys. Rev.* **D 63** (2001) 125023, arXiv:hep-th/0102026 [hep-th].

[4] Y. M. Cho and D. G. Pak, "Monopole condensation in SU(2) QCD," *Phys. Rev.* **D 65** (2002) 074027, arXiv:hep-th/0201179 [hep-th].

[5] K.-I. Kondo, S. Kato, A. Shibata, and T. Shinohara, "Quark confinement: Dual superconductor picture based on a non-Abelian Stokes theorem and reformulations of YangMills theory," *Phys. Rept.* **579** (2015) 1–226, arXiv:1409.1599 [hep-th].

[6] Y. S. Duan and M. L. Ge, "SU(2) gauge theory and the electrodynamics of n monopole system," *Scientia. Sinica. Mathematica.* **22** (1979) 1072.

[7] Y. Cho, "Glueball Spectrum in Extended QCD," *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **46** (1981) 302–306.

[8] J. Evslin, S. Giacomelli, K. Konishi, and A. Michelini, "Nonabelian Faddeev-Niemi Decomposition of the SU(3) Yang-Mills Theory," *JHEP* **1106** (2011) 094, arXiv:1103.5969 [hep-th].

[9] L. D. Faddeev and A. J. Niemi, "Spin-Charge Separation, Conformal Covariance and the SU(2) Yang-Mills Theory," *Nucl. Phys.* **B 776** (2007) 38–65, arXiv:hep-th/0608111 [hep-th].

[10] F. Lunev, "Three-dimensional Yang-Mills theory in gauge invariant variables," *Phys. Lett.* **B 295** (1992) 99–103.

[11] M. Halpern, "Field Strength Formulation of Quantum Chromodynamics," *Phys. Rev.* **D 16** (1977) 1798.

[12] P. E. Haagensen and K. Johnson, "Yang-Mills fields and Riemannian geometry," *Nucl. Phys.* **B 439** (1995) 597–616, arXiv:hep-th/9408164 [hep-th].

[13] D. Diakonov and V. Petrov, "Gauge invariant formulation of the d = 3 Yang-Mills theory," *Phys. Lett.* **B 493** (2000) 169–174, arXiv:hep-th/0009007 [hep-th].

[14] D. Diakonov and V. Petrov, "Yang-Mills theory as a quantum gravity with 'aether'," *Grav. Cosmol.* **8** (2002) 33–42, arXiv:hep-th/0108097 [hep-th].

[15] H. Verschelde, K. Knecht, K. Van Acoleyen, and M. Vanderkelen, "The Nonperturbative groundstate of QCD and the local composite operator A(mu)**2," *Phys. Lett.* **B 516** (2001) 307–313, arXiv:hep-th/0105018 [hep-th].

[16] P. Boucaud, A. Le Yaouanc, J. Leroy, J. Micheli, O. Pene, *et al.*, "Consistent OPE description of gluon two point and three point Green function?," *Phys. Lett.* **B 493** (2000) 315–324, arXiv:hep-ph/0008043 [hep-ph].

[17] F. Gubarev, L. Stodolsky, and V. I. Zakharov, "On the significance of the vector potential squared," *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86** (2001) 2220–2222, arXiv:hep-ph/0010057 [hep-ph].

[18] K.-I. Kondo, "Vacuum condensate of mass dimension 2 as the origin of mass gap and quark confinement," *Phys. Lett.* **B 514** (2001) 335–345, arXiv:hep-th/0105299 [hep-th].

[19] K.-I. Kondo, "Gauge-invariant gluon mass, infrared Abelian dominance and stability of magnetic vacuum," *Phys. Rev.* **D 74** (2006) 125003, arXiv:hep-th/0609166 [hep-th].

[20] X.-S. Chen, X.-F. Lu, W.-M. Sun, F. Wang, and T. Goldman, "Spin and orbital angular momentum in gauge theories: Nucleon spin structure and multipole radiation revisited," *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100** (2008) 232002, arXiv:0806.3166 [hep-ph].

[21] D. Sijacki and Y. Ne'eman, "QCD as an effective strong gravity," *Phys. Lett.* **B 247** (1990) 571–575.

[22] D. Karabali and V. P. Nair, "A Gauge invariant Hamiltonian analysis for nonAbelian gauge theories in (2+1)-dimensions," *Nucl. Phys.* **B 464** (1996) 135–152, arXiv:hep-th/9510157 [hep-th].

[23] A. Achucarro and P. K. Townsend, "A Chern-Simons Action for Three-Dimensional anti-De Sitter Supergravity Theories," *Phys. Lett.* **B 180** (1986) 89.

[24] E. Witten, "(2+1)-Dimensional Gravity as an Exactly Soluble System," *Nucl. Phys.* **B 311** (1988) 46.

[25] S. Nojiri and S. D. Odintsov, "Entropy bounds and Cardy-Verlinde formula in Yang-Mills theory," *Phys. Lett.* **B 540** (2002) 167, arXiv:hep-th/0205282 [hep-th].

[26] I. Mitra and H. Sharatchandra, "Dreibein (and metric) as prepotential for Yang-Mills theory," arXiv:1307.0989 [hep-th].

[27] K. S. Stelle, "Renormalization of Higher Derivative Quantum Gravity," *Phys. Rev.* **D 16** (1977) 953–969.

[28] H. W. Hamber, "Quantum gravitation: The Feynman path integral approach," *Quantum gravitation: The Feynman path integral approach, Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg* (2009) 59p.

[29] M. E. Peskin and D. V. Schroeder, "An Introduction to quantum field theory," *Reading, USA: Addison-Wesley* (1995) 374p.

[30] T. D. Lee and G. C. Wick, "Negative Metric and the Unitarity of the S Matrix," *Nucl. Phys.* **B 9** (1969) 209–243.

[31] T. D. Lee and G. C. Wick, "Finite Theory of Quantum Electrodynamics," *Phys. Rev.* **D 2** (1970) 1033–1048.

[32] B. Grinstein, D. O'Connell, and M. B. Wise, "The Lee-Wick standard model," *Phys. Rev.* **D 77** (2008) 025012, arXiv:0704.1845 [hep-ph].

[33] G. S. Bali, C. Bauer, and A. Pineda, "Model-independent determination of the gluon condensate in four-dimensional SU(3) gauge theory," *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113** (2014) 092001, arXiv:1403.6477 [hep-ph].

[34] J. S. Schwinger, "Gauge Invariance and Mass. 2.," *Phys. Rev.* **128** (1962) 2425–2429.

[35] X.-D. Ji, "Gauge invariant decomposition of nucleon spin and its spin-off," *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **78** (1997) 610, arXiv:hep-ph/9603249 [hep-ph].

[36] E. Leader and C. Lorce, "The angular momentum controversy: What's it all about and does it matter?," *Phys. Rept.* **541** (2013) 163–248, arXiv:1309.4235 [hep-ph].

[37] M. Wakamatsu, "Is gauge-invariant complete decomposition of the nucleon spin possible?," *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* **A 29** (2014) 1430012, arXiv:1402.4193 [hep-ph].

[38] M. Wakamatsu, "Gauge and frame-independent decomposition of nucleon spin," *Phys. Rev.* **D 83** (2011) 014012, arXiv:1007.5355 [hep-ph].

[39] P. Zhang and D. Pak, "On gauge invariant nucleon spin decomposition," *Eur. Phys. J.* **A 48** (2012) 91, arXiv:1110.6516 [hep-ph].

[40] Z.-Q. Guo and I. Schmidt, "Gauge invariant descriptions of gluon polarizations," *Phys. Rev.* **D 87** (2013) 114016, arXiv:1210.2263 [hep-ph].

[41] S. Mandelstam, "Vortices and Quark Confinement in Nonabelian Gauge Theories," *Phys. Rept.* **23** (1976) 245–249.

[42] A. M. Polyakov, "Quark Confinement and Topology of Gauge Groups," *Nucl. Phys.* **B 120** (1977) 429–458.

[43] G. 't Hooft, "A Property of Electric and Magnetic Flux in Nonabelian Gauge Theories," *Nucl. Phys.* **B 153** (1979) 141.

[44] H. B. Nielsen and P. Olesen, "Vortex Line Models for Dual Strings," *Nucl. Phys.* **B 61** (1973) 45–61.

[45] J. Evslin and S. Giacomelli, "A Faddeev-Niemi Solution that Does Not Satisfy Gauss' Law," *JHEP* **04** (2011) 022, arXiv:1010.1702 [hep-th].

[46] A. J. Niemi and A. Wereszczynski, "On Solutions to the 'Faddeev-Niemi' Equations," *J. Math. Phys.* **52** (2011) 072302, arXiv:1011.6667 [hep-th].

[47] C. Wetterich, "Exact evolution equation for the effective potential," *Phys. Lett.* **B 301** (1993) 90–94.

[48] T. R. Morris, "The Exact renormalization group and approximate solutions," *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* **A 9** (1994) 2411, arXiv:hep-ph/9308265 [hep-ph].

[49] J. Berges, N. Tetradis, and C. Wetterich, "Nonperturbative renormalization flow in quantum field theory and statistical physics," *Phys. Rept.* **363** (2002) 223–386, arXiv:hep-ph/0005122 [hep-ph].

[50] M. Reuter, "Nonperturbative evolution equation for quantum gravity," *Phys. Rev.* **D 57** (1998) 971–985, arXiv:hep-th/9605030 [hep-th].

[51] O. Lauscher and M. Reuter, "Ultraviolet fixed point and generalized flow equation of quantum gravity," *Phys. Rev.* **D 65** (2002) 025013, arXiv:hep-th/0108040 [hep-th].

[52] M. Reuter and F. Saueressig, "Quantum Einstein Gravity," *New J. Phys.* **14** (2012) 055022, arXiv:1202.2274 [hep-th].

[53] S. Coleman, "Aspects of Symmetry," *Cambridge University Press* (1985) 276p.

[54] G. V. Dunne, "Functional determinants in quantum field theory," *J. Phys.* **A 41** (2008) 304006, arXiv:0711.1178 [hep-th].

[55] N. K. Nielsen and P. Olesen, "An Unstable Yang-Mills Field Mode," *Nucl. Phys.* **B 144** (1978) 376.

[56] G. K. Savvidy, "Infrared Instability of the Vacuum State of Gauge Theories and Asymptotic Freedom," *Phys. Lett.* **B 71** (1977) 133.

[57] Y. M. Cho, F. H. Cho, and J. H. Yoon, "Dimensional Transmutation by Monopole Condensation in QCD," *Phys. Rev.* **D 87** (2013) 085025, arXiv:1206.6936 [hep-th].

[58] N. K. Nielsen and P. Olesen, "Electric Vortex Lines From the Yang-Mills Theory," *Phys. Lett.* **B79** (1978) 304.

[59] J. Ambjorn and P. Olesen, "On the Formation of a Random Color Magnetic Quantum Liquid in QCD," *Nucl. Phys.* **B 170** (1980) 60.

[60] R. P. Woodard, "Avoiding dark energy with 1/r modifications of gravity," *Lect. Notes Phys.* **720** (2007) 403–433, arXiv:astro-ph/0601672 [astro-ph].

[61] L. Allen, M. Beijersbergen, R. Spreeuw, and J. Woerdman, "Orbital angular momentum of light and the transformation of Laguerre-Gaussian laser modes," *Phys. Rev.* **A 45** (1992) 8185–8189.

[62] S. M. Barnett and L. Allen, "Orbital angular momentum and nonparaxial light beams," *Optics Communications* **110** (1994) 670.

[63] Z.-Q. Guo and I. Schmidt, "Gauge Invariant Descriptions of Gluon Polarizations Revisited," *Phys. Rev.* **D 87** (2013) 114017, arXiv:1303.7210 [hep-ph].

[64] A. Campoleoni, S. Fredenhagen, S. Pfenninger, and S. Theisen, "Towards metric-like higher-spin gauge theories in three dimensions," *J. Phys.* **A 46** (2013) 214017, arXiv:1208.1851 [hep-th].

[65] I. Fujisawa and R. Nakayama, "Second-Order Formalism for 3D Spin-3 Gravity," *Class. Quant. Grav.* **30** (2013) 035003, arXiv:1209.0894 [hep-th].

[66] S. Fredenhagen and P. Kessel, "Metric- and frame-like higher-spin gauge theories in three dimensions," *J. Phys.* **A 48** no. 3, (2015) 035402, arXiv:1408.2712 [hep-th].

[67] Z.-Q. Guo, "Metric-Like Formulation Of the Spin-Three Gravity In Three Dimensions," *Phys. Rev.* **D 90** (2014) 121702, arXiv:1408.2806 [hep-th].

[68] J. M. Martin-Garcia, "xPerm: fast index canonicalization for tensor computer algebra," *Comp. Phys. Commun.* **179** (2008) 597, arXiv:0803.0862 [cs.SC].

[69] T. Searight, "On degenerate metrics and electromagnetism," *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **35** (2003) 791–805, arXiv:hep-th/0405204 [hep-th].

[70] I. G. Shandra, "Pseudoconnections and manifolds with degenerate metrics," *J. Math. Sci. (N. Y.)* **119** (2004) 658.

[71] K. Jensen, "On the coupling of Galilean-invariant field theories to curved spacetime," arXiv:1408.6855 [hep-th].

[72] L. S. Brown, "Quantum Field Theory," *Cambridge University Press* (1994) 54p.